

## LCQ10: Income limit for applicants of subsidised sale housing

Following is a question by Hon Alice Mak and a written reply by the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Mr Frank Chan Fan, in the Legislative Council today (June 26):

Question:

The subsidised sale flats (SSFs) put up for sale in recent years have met with overwhelming responses, with oversubscriptions easily reaching dozens of times. As no minimum income requirement has been set in the relevant eligibility criteria, some members of the public have applied for purchasing SSFs in the names of their family members who have no income (e.g. children who have just reached the age of 18 and are students) in order to increase their chances of success in the ballots. However, such "buyers" simply are unable to make the down payments nor repay the mortgage loans by themselves. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the median monthly household income of the applicants in each sale exercise for the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats in the past three years;

(2) of the number of HOS flats sold in each of the past three years, and set out (i) a breakdown by the group to which the monthly household income of the buyers belonged (as set out in the table below) and (ii) the corresponding percentages;

Monthly household income (\$)	2016		2017		2018	
	(i)	(ii)	(i)	(ii)	(i)	(ii)
5,000 or below						
5,001 to 10,000						
10,001 to 20,000						
20,001 to 30,000						
30,001 to 40,000						
40,001 to 50,000						
50,001 or above						
Total:		100%		100%		100%

(3) whether it knows, among the buyers in each sale exercise since 2014 for flats under HOS, the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme and the White Form Secondary Market Scheme, the respective numbers of those whose mortgage loan agreements contained mortgage guarantors;

(4) as the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) provides mortgage default

guarantee to financial institutions with whom HA has entered into a Deed of Guarantee so that they can offer more favourable mortgage terms to SSF buyers (e.g. a mortgage loan-to-value ratio of 90 per cent or above), whether the Government has assessed the financial risks posed to HA by the situation that some buyers are unable to repay mortgage loans by themselves; if so, of the outcome; if not, whether it will conduct such an assessment; and

(5) whether it will tighten the eligibility criteria for SSFs by setting a minimum income requirement, so as to ensure that the buyers are able to repay mortgage loans by themselves?

Reply:

President,

My response to the question raised by Hon Alice Mak is as follows –

(1) and (2) In the past three years, the number of Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats sold by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) was as follows:

	Number of flats sold
Sale of HOS Flats 2016	2 657
Sale of HOS Flats 2017	2 120*
Sale of HOS Flats 2018	4 431

\* Including 63 HOS flats in 2014 for resale

Source: HA's administrative records

Since the Sale of HOS Flats 2017, the survey conducted by HA after each pre-sale of HOS flats covers information on the monthly household income and planned financial arrangements of successful buyers. According to the Major findings of the Survey on Applicants of the Sale of HOS Flats 2017 (Note 1), the distribution of monthly household income of successful buyers is as follows:

Monthly household income	Buyers of the Sale of HOS Flats 2017*		
		< \$20,000	13%
\$20,000 – < \$30,000	23%		
\$30,000 – < \$40,000	31%		
\$40,000 – < \$50,000	22%		
≥ \$50,000	11%		
Total	100%		
Median	\$30,000		

\* Including White Form and Green Form buyers

Source: HA's Major findings of the Survey on Applicants of the Sale of HOS Flats 2017

Since flat selection of the Sale of HOS Flats 2018 just completed in May 2019, the survey on HOS applicants has yet to start.

(3) and (4) In order to assist the purchasers of subsidised sale flats (SSFs) in obtaining favourable mortgage loan (Note 2), HA will provide mortgage default guarantee to participating banks or financial institutions. Under the Deed of Guarantee executed by both parties, banks or financial institutions shall not require the purchasers to provide other security.

Banks or financial institutions shall exercise due prudence when approving the purchaser's mortgage application pursuant to their commercial operating principles. Accordingly, the Deed of Guarantee stipulates that banks or financial institutions are entitled on prudential grounds to refuse to provide finance to any purchaser. It is understood that banks or financial institutions will take into account all relevant factors, including the applicant's financial position, past credit data and the condition of the property, etc., in vetting mortgage applications.

Besides, if an owner, who has mortgaged the SSF purchased to a bank or financial institution that has entered into a Deed of Guarantee with HA, defaults on mortgage payments before paying off the mortgage loan, the bank or financial institution is required to exhaust all its remedies which includes seeking repayment from the owner and selling the flat before it is entitled to make a claim for payment under the Deed of Guarantee. The guarantee provided by HA is a deficiency guarantee, meaning that should the sale proceeds of the flat fail to cover the full outstanding balance of the mortgage and all the interest, legal costs, administration fees, etc. payable under the mortgage, HA shall then pay the arrears to the bank or financial institution. HA will subsequently seek to recover such payments and interest from the owner.

In addition, HA's Application Guides for SSFs also require purchasers to assess their own financial capability and eligibility for mortgage before proceeding with the purchasing formalities.

(5) The Deed of Guarantee executed by HA and banks or financial institutions has already provided a mechanism to minimise HA's financial risk. In fact, when HA's Subsidised Housing Committee (SHC) discussed the proposed income and asset limits for White Form applicants for the Sale of HOS Flats 2014 (Note 3) at its meeting of November 10, 2014, it also deliberated on whether a minimum income/asset level should be imposed on White Form applicants. SHC took the view that such minimum level should not be imposed for the following considerations:

(i) Imposing a minimum income/asset level may inadvertently affect those with genuine need to purchase HOS flats. Specifically, those with income and asset below the minimum levels will become ineligible for HOS, even if they may have other means to help finance the purchase;

(ii) Since the launch of HOS, it has been a practice for HA to allow HOS buyers to accept financial support from family members/friends. In fact,

according to the Major findings of the Survey on Applicants of the Sale of HOS Flats 2017, about 22 per cent of buyers intended to get financial support from parents, while 11 per cent of buyers planned to get financial support from friends/relatives and children respectively to finance their mortgage down payment (Note 4);

(iii) In Hong Kong, obtaining financial assistance from families/friends for home purchase is a very common arrangement and is generally accepted by the public. Some young people may have difficulties saving sufficient money on their own for the down payment of private flats particularly when property prices are relatively high; and

(iv) Green Form applicants for HOS may also have very low income/asset levels. Therefore, if a minimum income/asset level is imposed on White Form applicants, there may be criticisms from White Form applicants. Such criticisms are expected to be particularly strong among young people who have difficulties buying properties under the current market conditions.

Note 1: Details can be found in HA's Subsidised Housing Committee paper no. 69/2018

([www.housingauthority.gov.hk/en/common/pdf/about-us/housing-authority/ha-paper-library/SHC69-18EN.pdf](http://www.housingauthority.gov.hk/en/common/pdf/about-us/housing-authority/ha-paper-library/SHC69-18EN.pdf)).

Note 2: Some of the mortgage terms are as follows:

(a) loan amount: for HOS and the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme, the maximum loan amount may not exceed the balance of the purchase price after deposit; for the White Form Secondary Market Scheme, the maximum loan amount may not exceed 90 per cent of the purchase price or the assessed value, whichever is less;

(b) repayment period: maximum of 25 years; and

(c) interest rate: the maximum interest rate shall not exceed the Best Lending Rate quoted by the bank or financial institution concerned minus 0.5 per cent per annum.

Note 3: Details can be found in HA's Subsidised Housing Committee paper no. 66/2014

(<https://www.housingauthority.gov.hk/en/common/pdf/about-us/housing-authority/ha-paper-library/SHC66-14.pdf>).

Note 4: Interviewees were allowed to choose more than one source of funding.

---

## **LCQ16: Workmanship of subsidised housing units**

Following is a question by the Hon WU Chi-wai, MH and a written reply by the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Mr Frank Chan Fan, in the Legislative

Council today (Jun 26):

Question:

It has been reported that in recent years, quite a number of members of the public have, after moving into newly completed units of public rental housing, and those under the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (GSH), found that both the materials and the workmanship of the in-flat installations are of poor quality. Some members of the construction industry have pointed out that the causes for such a situation include a shortage of experienced construction workers in recent years, and an increased use of precast concrete components (PCCs) in the construction of these subsidized housing. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) in respect of the three aforesaid types of subsidized housing projects completed within the past five years, of the respective numbers of complaints/reports received by the Housing Department (HD) from residents about quality problems of the materials and workmanship of the in-flat installations, and among such complaints/reports, the respective numbers of those which were (i) made via the Defects Report Forms and (ii) made after the expiry of the warranty periods of their HOS and GSH units;

(2) in respect of the complaints/reports mentioned in (1)(i) and (ii) respectively, of the following information on each problem in the past five years relating to the quality of materials and workmanship: (i) the number of cases handled, (ii) the average time taken for the repair works, (iii) the longest time taken for the repair works, and (iv) the number of cases not handled, and set out the information by the name of each subsidized housing project and in tables of the same format as the table below;

Name of subsidized housing project:\_\_\_\_\_

Problem	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
Water seepage on the wall				
Water seepage on the ceiling				
Window problems				
...				
Other problems				
Total:		Not applicable	Not applicable	

(3) of the most common in-flat problems involving substandard workmanship and installations (e.g. kitchen doors not meeting the fire resistance standard) that were identified by HD in the past five years in the course of hand-over inspections of the three aforesaid types of subsidized housing units;

(4) regarding the construction works in the past five years for the three types of subsidized housing projects respectively, of the (i) percentage of PCCs used on average, (ii) the number of days taken for the construction of a typical floor on average, and (iii) the number of man-days taken for the construction of a unit on average, for each of the projects; whether HD assessed, in the course of the hand-over inspections of such units, the impacts of such factors on the workmanship; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(5) whether HD issued in the past five years advices or warnings to or imposed penalties on the contractors of subsidized housing projects due to quality problems of materials and workmanship; if so, of the details;

(6) of the measures put in place to enhance the supervision of the workmanship of subsidized housing projects (e.g. increasing the number of inspection items and the frequency of random inspections during the construction stage, as well as reviewing the construction methods and the procedure and criteria for hand-over inspections); and

(7) whether it will consider extending the warranty period for subsidized sale units and taking other measures to better protect the rights and interests of owners who have purchased such units?

Reply:

President,

My consolidated reply to Hon WU Chi-wai's question is as follows:

The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) has all along been placing a high priority on the quality of its construction works, and has put in place a stringent system for inspecting and accepting completed works. From ensuring the fulfillment of contractual requirements, conducting site monitoring/inspections, to performing tests upon completion of the works, HA has been strictly monitoring the building contractors. This system applies to all HA's public housing developments, including Public Rental Housing (PRH) and the Subsidised Sale Flats (SSFs). The latter includes the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS), and the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (GSH) projects.

Before completion of the works contract, HA performs detailed inspections and checking in each flat to ensure that the quality of the works complies with the contractual requirements. If any situation of non-compliance with the contract is identified, HA shall request the contractor to follow-up and rectify, and conduct another round of inspection. This will ensure that the construction quality meets the required standards.

Under the current mechanism, if the tenant/owner has identified anomaly in facilities or installations of the flat within seven days of taking over the flat and that decoration works have not yet started, he/she can submit a 'Defects Report Form' to the In-take Ambassador. If the anomaly is, upon

verification, confirmed as a building defect which the contractor is accountable for, the contractor will arrange the conduct of the rectification works for the tenant/owner. For SSFs, HA provides HOS and GSH flats with one-year maintenance period and ten-year Structural Safety Guarantee for the in-flats installations, finishes and facilities as stipulated in the sales brochures.

HA has always been concerning about the construction quality and has already included the "Average number of defects per flat at handover to tenants/owners for flats completed within the year" as one of its Key Performance Indicators. Our annual target is not exceeding 0.7 defects per flat. We were able to meet this target at the year-end performance reviews in the past few years (see Annex for the number of defects). In the past five years up to end May 2019, among the 77 215 completed public housing flats, HA has received about 440 verified defect cases, among which about 300 were in PRH, about 110 were in HOS and about 30 were in GSH(Note). Generally speaking, these defects involved water seepage, leakage from fittings, damaged tiles and cracks at plastering, etc. HA did not come to aware of situation involving facilities in the flats not meeting the stipulated standards.

After the tenants/owners submit the "Defects Report Forms", HA will arrange its staff to follow up with the residents as soon as possible, and arrange the rectification works according to the needs of the individual residents. HA does not keep statistics on the time required for conducting the rectification work. The time required depends on the types of the works involved. In general, rectification works within residential flat, such as those related to damaged tiling and water seepage at ceiling or wall, etc. takes about one to three weeks to complete. For other minor items such as damages to window hardware, lock or hinges, etc., rectification could be completed within a week. HA does not keep statistics on the complaints/reports from residents about quality problems of the materials and workmanship of the in-flat installations after the expiry of the defects liability warranty period.

HA has many years of experience in applying precast concrete components (PCCs) in public housing developments. Practitioners of the construction industry generally consider that such technology can improve the buildings quality. The PCCs adopted by HA generally include staircase, façade, semi-precast slab, volumetric precast bathroom, volumetric precast kitchen, partition wall, beam, balcony and refuse chute, which make up about 35 per cent of concrete volume of a typical floor and 70 per cent precast rate on plan on average. HA determines the applicable areas of PCCs in individual project based on the corresponding conditions and settings. Owing to the different design, layout and site constraints of individual projects, HA does not have a unified construction cycle index. In general, HA can complete the main concrete structure of a typical floor in six working days and the worker per flat ratio is about 0.12 on average. This construction cycle has balanced the work schedule, site safety and the quality of buildings and is generally recognised by the industry.

Regarding contractor monitoring, HA will continue to monitor different aspects of the performance of the building contractors in HA's works contracts, including progress of works, use of materials, quality of works, site and environment management, site safety and payment of wages, etc. If the building contractor does not perform satisfactorily, HA will issue reminder letters, warning letters, or even suspend the concerned contractor from tendering HA's contracts as appropriate. In the past five years, HA suspended six new building works contractors from tendering due to unsatisfactory performance on the use of materials and quality of works etc. Among the six contractors, four were directly involved in the incident of "excess lead in drinking water" in 2015. HA will continue to monitor the use of materials and quality of works of public housing developments.

Note: The defect cases reported by tenants/ owners via the "Defects Situation Report" and verified did not include the minor defects that could be rectified by the contractor within a day, such as cleansing, tightening loosened metallic parts or lubricating, etc.

---

## **Red flags at some beaches lowered**

Attention TV/radio announcers:

Please broadcast the following as soon as possible:

Here is an item of interest to swimmers.

The Leisure and Cultural Services Department announced today (June 26) that the Environmental Protection Department has classified the water quality at Lido Beach, Casam Beach and Hoi Mei Wan Beach in Tsuen Wan District as Grade 3, which means the water quality has improved and the beaches are suitable for swimming. The red flags have been lowered.

The red flags were hoisted at these beaches earlier on due to the water quality being classified as Grade 4 and unsuitable for swimming.

---

## **LCQ17: Welfare of animals**

Following is a question by the Hon Chan Hak-kan and a written reply by the Secretary for Food and Health, Professor Sophia Chan, in the Legislative Council today (June 26):

Question:

Regarding the welfare of animals, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that a government official said at a Panel meeting of this Council held last month that the Government was heading towards the goal of "zero euthanasia of animals", of the Government's specific measures to achieve that goal; whether it has set interim goals and the relevant dates for achieving the goals; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) given that the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) invited in November last year suggestions from animal welfare organisations (AWOs) on places that might be suitable for conducting the Trap-Neuter-Return trial programme for stray dogs (the trial programme), of the number and details of the suggestions received by AFCD to date; the resources needed for implementing the programme as estimated by the Government;

(3) as AFCD has indicated that the trial programme conducted in the past three years did not achieve the predetermined performance targets, whether the Government will take the initiative to explore suitable places for AFCD to implement a new round of the trial programme; if not, of the reasons for that;

(4) as the Rabies Ordinance (Cap. 421) provides that a keeper of animals who, without reasonable excuse, abandons his mammal (except a human being) commits an offence, of the conviction rates of the relevant prosecutions in the past five years; whether the Government will step up law enforcement efforts, and of the law enforcement manpower in each of the coming three years;

(5) of the current procedure to be followed by animal owners for surrendering to the Animal Management Centres (AMCs) under AFCD the animals that they no longer keep; given that the Government has recently proposed to amend the legislation to introduce the concept of "duty of care" to animals on the part of the persons responsible for the animals, and proposed that the abandonment of an animal should be regarded as a contravention of the duty of care and an offence, whether the Government anticipates that the number of animals to be received by AMCs will increase after the implementation of the relevant legislative amendments; if so, of AFCD's counter measures;

(6) whether it will consider, by drawing reference from the practices in other places, collecting fees from persons abandoning animals, so as to subsidise the relevant expenses of AWOs;

(7) given that the governments of places such as Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the United States have established online platforms for animal owners to register animals and report on loss of animals, whether the Government will develop a similar online platform; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(8) given that the number of animals re-homed dropped from 966 in 2014 to 753 in 2018, of the Government's measures to encourage members of the public to

adopt animals, e.g. whether it will (i) establish an online platform, (ii) establish a dedicated animal adoption fund, and (iii) provide incentives (e.g. healthcare vouchers for pets, and waivers of fees for dog licences); if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(9) given that the main problems currently faced by AWOs are difficulties in finding suitable venues and paying high rents for venues, whether the Government will offer assistance in this regard, including extending the use of the subventions provided for such organisations to include payment of rents; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

Reply:

President,

(1) The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach for promoting animal welfare. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) promotes caring for animals and responsible pet ownership through public education and publicity, and also collaborates with animal welfare organisations (AWOs) in animal adoption, with a view to reducing the number of stray animals and animals euthanised.

Since 2011, the AFCD has been providing subventions to AWOs in supporting their work in promoting animal welfare and animal adoption, including setting up animal rehoming centre(s), enhancing facilities of rehoming centre(s) and providing neutering and medical services to animals adopted, conducting education seminars at schools and in the community, organising publicity activities for promoting the animal adoption services, etc. This year, we have increased the amount of subvention to AWOs with a view to strengthening their work in this aspect.

The above measures have started to bear fruit in recent years. In the past five years, the number of dogs and cats euthanised dropped 73 per cent and 68 per cent respectively. We will keep up our efforts in this respect.

The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) agrees that in situations where the number of stray dogs caught remain high or the dogs are not fit for adoption despite the deployment of various stray dog management measures, euthanasia would be an appropriate solution. Euthanasia is also adopted in many overseas places to safeguard the welfare of those old or ailing animals.

(2) and (3) The AFCD assisted two AWOs in conducting the "Trap-Neuter-Return" (TNR) trial programme for stray dogs at two trial sites between 2015 and 2018. The findings showed that the programme did not achieve the predetermined performance targets. In this connection, the AFCD has no plan to implement similar programme. Nevertheless, we keep an open mind and will assist AWOs that are interested in conducting this type of programme at other specific locations. To this end, the AFCD has liaised with AWOs by issuing letters to them last November and released such information on its [thematic website](#). So far, no application has been received. In case any organisation is interested in conducting a similar programme in the future, the AFCD will

provide active support, including sharing experiences, conducting district consultations and seeking approval from the Legislative Council for the relevant legislative exemption.

(4) and (5) In accordance with section 22 of the Rabies Ordinance (Cap. 421), a keeper of any animal who, without reasonable excuse, abandons that animal is liable to a maximum fine of \$10,000 and imprisonment for up to six months. From past experience, in adducing evidence to substantiate a case under the Ordinance, it is difficult for the prosecution to prove beyond reasonable doubt that a person abandons an animal without a reasonable excuse, particularly in those cases where there is no witness. There has been no successful prosecution instituted under section 22 of the Ordinance over the past five years.

Nevertheless, if the AFCD manages to identify the owner of a stray dog and learns upon investigation that the dog went astray and has been reclaimed by its owner, a prosecution will be instituted on evidence against the dog owner for failing to keep his/her dog under proper control in a public place in accordance with section 23 of the Ordinance. Any person in contravention of the said provision is liable to a maximum fine of \$10,000. Between 2014 and 2018, there were a total of 1 117 prosecutions instituted in accordance with section 23 of the Ordinance, among which 1 083 resulted in successful prosecution.

In addition, we are currently conducting a public consultation on proposals to enhance animal welfare, including imposing in the legislation a "duty of care" on persons responsible for animals, i.e. persons responsible for animals must take reasonable measures to ensure that the welfare needs of animals are met. Abandoning animals can be treated as a contravention of the duty of care and is liable to prosecution. The proposals, if implemented, will be conducive to supporting the prosecution against animal abandonment. The AFCD will take account of the views received during the consultation period when drafting legislative amendments, and deploy necessary manpower and resources to handle the work. The AFCD will also continue to strengthen the promotion and education on the proper concept of keeping animals in order to reduce pet abandonment. We are currently unable to estimate whether the number of animals received by the management centres will increase subsequent to the proposed legislative amendments.

If pet owners are no longer able to keep their animals and surrender them to the AFCD, the AFCD will look into the reasons behind and endeavour to propose possible options to assist owners in continuing keeping the animals. If members of the public are no longer able to keep the animals due to economic or environmental issues, personal or family member's illness or other reasons, the AFCD will receive such animals out of consideration for protecting animal welfare. If these animals are assessed by a veterinary surgeon as in good health and having a gentle temperament, the AFCD will arrange their transfer to AWOs for adoption by members of the public.

(6) At present, the Government receives animals abandoned by members of the public with an aim to protect animal welfare. Levying a charge may discourage

owners from surrendering animals to the Government and increase the possibility of animal abandonment. We therefore have no plan to charge persons for surrendering pets to the AFCD at the moment. Nevertheless, the AFCD will also continue to provide subventions to AWOs.

(7) If one's pet has gone astray, he/she may report the loss to the AFCD through different channels, including calling the Government hotline 1823, emailing to the AFCD ([mailbox@afcd.gov.hk](mailto:mailbox@afcd.gov.hk)) or making a report of the loss in person to AFCD's Animal Management Centres (AMCs), with detailed information and description of the lost pet, in order to seek assistance. Upon receipt of such a report, AFCD's staff will check if there is any animal in the AMCs that matches with the information/description of the animal, and will inform the pet owner accordingly.

We are aware that pet owners in some overseas places are required to report the loss of their pets to private companies responsible for the management of animal information on microchips, rather than official organisations, which might be different to the situation in Hong Kong. We consider that there are now sufficient channels for members of the public to report the loss of their pets, and AFCD's staff will provide suitable assistance upon receipt of reports.

(8) The number of cats and dogs received and caught by the AFCD dropped from 7 995 in 2014 to 2 943 in 2018 while the ratio of their adoption increased from 11.1 per cent to 22.6 per cent.

At present, some AWOs upload information of the animals to be adopted onto their websites and are open to enquiries for animal rehoming. For any mode of rehoming service (including matching on online platforms), it is necessary to assess the suitability of a prospective adopter, the living environment available for animal adoption, and to take follow-up actions to see if the adopter takes proper care of the animal rehomed. It is more appropriate for non-profit-making AWOs armed with the relevant experience and adopter network to liaise with adopters, identify their needs and carry out assessments.

The AFCD has been carrying out public education and publicity to remind the public that, before deciding to keep a pet, they have to give careful consideration to a range of factors, including their living environment, time available for taking care of pets, whether their family members are willing to keep pets and the expenditure on pet-keeping. We consider the use of publicity and education to encourage animal adoption more appropriate than provision of monetary incentives. Currently, AFCD's subventions to AWOs also cover their publicity work on animal rehoming services. Thus, we do not see the need to set up a dedicated fund for this particular purpose.

(9) At present, subventions to AWOs are granted on a project-by-project basis, but do not cover recurrent expenditures such as rentals, staff remuneration, etc. According to AFCD's understanding, many AWOs mainly rely on foster homes to take care of animals to be adopted. This practice can provide more opportunities for the animals to interact with people and

increase their chance of adoption. AWOs in need of premises running rehoming centres may consider the suitability of vacant government sites, including vacant school premises sites, under the management of the Lands Department that are available for leasing by non-governmental organisations for community purposes on short-term basis. Non-profit making AWOs may also apply for subsidies from a funding scheme run by the Development Bureau to carry out one-off, basic and necessary restoration works so as to put the vacant government sites fit-for-use as rehoming centres.

---

## **Lifesaving services suspended at Golden Beach and Cafeteria Old Beach**

Attention TV/radio announcers:

Please broadcast the following as soon as possible and repeat it at regular intervals:

The Leisure and Cultural Services Department announced today (June 26) that due to an insufficient number of lifeguards on duty, the lifesaving services at Golden Beach and Café Cafeteria Old Beach in Tuen Mun District are suspended until further notice.

First aid services will be maintained at the beaches.