

**Memorandum for the Subsidised Housing Committee of  
the Hong Kong Housing Authority**

**Major Findings of the Public Housing Recurrent Survey 2023**

**PURPOSE**

This paper presents the major findings of the Public Housing Recurrent Survey (PHRS) 2023.

**BACKGROUND**

2. PHRS has been conducted by the Housing Department since 1992<sup>Note 1</sup> to collect statistics on socio-economic characteristics of households currently living in the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA)'s public housing (including public rental housing (PRH)<sup>Note 2</sup> and subsidised sale flats<sup>Note 3</sup>) as well as their views on a number of housing issues. The sample size of PHRS 2023 was about 6 500 households, comprising 4 500 households in PRH units and 2 000 households in subsidised sale flats. The overall response rate was about 76%.

---

Note 1 PHRS was conducted annually prior to 2017 and biennially thereafter.

Note 2 PRH units exclude Interim Housing units.

Note 3 Subsidised sale flats include Home Ownership Scheme (HOS), Private Sector Participation Scheme (PSPS), Middle Income Housing Scheme (MIHS), Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS), Buy or Rent Option Scheme (BRO), Mortgage Subsidy Scheme (MSS) and Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (GSH) flats of HA, but exclude those with premium paid and tradable in open market.

## **FINDINGS OF PHRS 2023**

----- 3. The major findings of PHRS 2023 are set out at the **Appendix**. Where appropriate, the statistics from PHRS conducted in previous round(s) are also presented for comparison purpose. Unless otherwise specified, the statistics presented reflect the results of the survey conducted in the first quarter of the respective reference year.

## **INFORMATION**

4. This paper is issued for Members' information.

Lennon WONG  
Secretary, Subsidised Housing Committee  
Tel. No.: 2761 5033  
Fax No.: 2761 0019

File Ref. : HD(STAT) 8-2/2/2C  
(Strategy Division)  
Date of Issue : 6 March 2024

## FINDINGS OF PUBLIC HOUSING RECURRENT SURVEY 2023

(Unless otherwise specified, the statistics presented reflect the results of the survey conducted in the first quarter of the respective reference year.)

### I. Characteristics of Households in Public Rental Housing (PRH) and Subsidised Sale Flats (SSF)

#### (a) PRH <sup>Note 1</sup>

##### *Number of households*

The number of PRH households had increased gradually in the past five years. This is broadly in line with the increase in the number of new PRH flats over the past five years. **(Table 1)**

Table 1: Number of PRH households <sup>Note 2</sup>

As at end-March	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
No. of households	779 900	779 800	786 300	791 200	805 000

##### *Household size*

2. The average PRH household size had dropped from 2.7 persons in 2019 to 2.6 persons in 2023. This is in line with the decreasing trend of the average household size of all households in Hong Kong as surveyed by the Census and Statistics Department. **(Table 2)**

Table 2: Average household size of PRH households

As at end-March	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Average household size	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6

---

Note 1 Statistics of PRH, including number of households, household size, and number of elderly households, are based on the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA)'s administrative records instead of the Public Housing Recurrent Survey (PHRS) findings.

Note 2 The change in the number of PRH households in a particular year may not match with the number of PRH flats completed in the same year. The difference is subject to a number of factors, e.g. flats completed towards the end of a particular year may only be taken up in the following year; sale of some flats under the Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS); demolition of flats in redevelopment projects; letting of vacant flats within existing PRH stock, etc.

***Elderly households*** <sup>Note 3</sup>

3. The number of elderly households in PRH had increased over the past five years. This is consistent with the ageing trend of the Hong Kong population. **(Table 3)**

Table 3: Number of elderly households in PRH

<b>As at end-March</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
No. of elderly households	160 800	166 600	172 900	179 800	189 600
As a proportion of PRH households	21%	21%	22%	23%	24%

***Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) households***

4. 13% of the PRH households had members receiving CSSA <sup>Note 4</sup> in 2023, slightly dropping from 15% in 2019. **(Table 4)**

Table 4: Proportion of CSSA households in PRH

<b>As at end-March</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
As a proportion of PRH households	15%	14%	14%	14%	13%

**(b) SSF**

5. Based on survey findings, the average household size of SSF households had dropped from 3.1 persons in 2019 to 2.8 persons in 2023. This is in line with the decreasing trend of the average household size of all households in Hong Kong as surveyed by the Census and Statistics Department. **(Table 5)**

Table 5: Average household size of SSF households <sup>Note 5</sup>

	<b>2019</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2023</b>
Average household size	3.1	2.9	2.8

---

Note 3 Elderly households refer to households of which all members are elderly aged 60 or above.

Note 4 The percentage is calculated in accordance with cases of direct rent payment by the Social Welfare Department in HA's administrative records.

Note 5 Average household size of SSF households was not available for 2020 and 2022, as the biennial PHRS was not conducted in these two years.

## **II. Views on PRH-related Matters**

6. Views on PRH-related matters including estate management and maintenance services, environmental awareness, schemes for fostering harmonious families in PRH and rent payment were surveyed in PHRS. Broadly speaking, similar findings were noted for PHRS 2021. Details are set out in paragraphs 8 to 26.

7. The PHRS 2023 was conducted in the first quarter of 2023, which was before the various enhanced measures recently implemented in respect of combating tenancy abuse, enhanced Well-off Tenants Policies <sup>Note 6</sup>, and the Marking Scheme <sup>Note 7</sup>. As such, the views collected in the survey were based on the past situation and did not reflect the measures introduced after the first quarter of 2023.

---

Note 6 HA's Subsidised Housing Committee (SHC) endorsed on 24 May 2023 the new measures to combat tenancy abuse and enhanced Well-off Tenants Policies, which have been implemented since October 2023. The measures include (i) tenants and all family members are required to declare every two years since admission to PRH that whether they had continuously resided in the PRH units, complied with the terms in the tenancy agreement regarding occupancy status, and whether they own domestic properties in Hong Kong; (ii) they are also required to undertake that they would declare to HA after having acquired a domestic property in Hong Kong; (iii) tenants with tenancies terminated due to tenancy abuse are barred from re-applying for PRH within five years, and etc.

Note 7 SHC endorsed on 24 May 2023 the implementation of measures to enhance the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in PRH Estates by increasing penalty points for nine misdeed items related to environmental hygiene, public safety and serious breach of tenancy agreement; and widening the scope of two misdeed items related to environmental hygiene and/or serious breach of tenancy agreement. The enhanced measure has been implemented since 18 December 2023.

**(a) Views of PRH Households on Estate Management**

***General estate management services***

8. The table below shows the views of PRH households on four aspects of estate management services. Among them, PRH households were most satisfied with the quality of security services (78%). **(Table 6)**

Table 6: Views on general estate management services

	<b>2021</b>	<b>2023</b>
<b>Sense of responsibility of estate officers</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	67%	68%
Fair	28%	28%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	4%	4%
<b>Quality of security services</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	80%	78%
Fair	17%	19%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	3%	3%
<b>Cleanliness and hygienic condition of common areas</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	62%	60%
Fair	25%	28%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	13%	12%
<b>Maintenance-related services in their premises and the estate common areas</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	63%	63%
Fair	25%	27%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	12%	10%

Note: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

***Maintenance service for households' premises***

9. About 40% of the PRH households had requested the Housing Department (HD) or the management agent to carry out repair works inside their premises in the past one-year period before the survey. Some 72% of them were satisfied with the overall maintenance service provided. Among the different aspects of maintenance service provided, PRH households were most satisfied with the work attitude of workers (84%). **(Table 7)**

Table 7: Views <sup>(1)</sup> on maintenance service for PRH households' premises

	2021	2023
<b>Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance requests</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	79%	79%
Fair	16%	18%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	4%	3%
<b>Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	74%	72%
Fair	17%	21%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	8%	7%
<b>Work attitude of workers</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	84%	84%
Fair	14%	13%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	2%	3%
<b>Quality of works</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	66%	73%
Fair	22%	20%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	11%	7%
<b>Improvement of environment after the maintenance works</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	73%	73%
Fair	20%	20%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	8%	7%
<b>Overall maintenance service inside premises</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	74%	72%
Fair	20%	23%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	6%	5%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

(1) Views were collected from PRH households who had asked HD or the management agent to carry out repair works inside their premises in the past one-year period before the survey.

***Maintenance service for estate common areas***

10. About 66% of the PRH households who were aware of the repair works carried out in the estate common areas were satisfied with the overall performance of the maintenance service. **(Table 8)**

Table 8: Views <sup>(1)</sup> on maintenance service for estate common areas

	2021	2023
<b>Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance enquiries</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	71%	69%
Fair	26%	28%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	4%	3%
<b>Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	65%	57%
Fair	26%	34%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	9%	9%
<b>Maintenance of estates' outdoor facilities (e.g. playground)</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	65%	65%
Fair	28%	28%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	7%	7%
<b>Improvement of environment in common areas after the maintenance works</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	73%	69%
Fair	21%	27%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	6%	4%
<b>Overall maintenance service of estate common areas</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	72%	66%
Fair	24%	30%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	4%	4%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

- (1) Views were collected from PRH households who were aware of the repair works carried out in the estate common areas in the past one-year period before the survey.



11. On the maintenance service of the building, PRH households were most satisfied with the maintenance of electrical installations (91%). **(Table 9)**

Table 9: Views <sup>(1)</sup> on maintenance service of the building

	2021	2023
<b>Maintenance of lifts</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	73%	71%
Fair	17%	20%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	10%	9%
<b>Maintenance of electrical installations (e.g. reliability of power supply)</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	90%	91%
Fair	10%	7%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	1%	2%
<b>Maintenance of lighting systems</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	86%	83%
Fair	12%	14%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	3%	3%
<b>Maintenance of fire services installations</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	83%	85%
Fair	14%	13%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	3%	2%
<b>Maintenance of security systems</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	82%	80%
Fair	14%	17%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	3%	3%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

- (1) Views were collected from PRH households who were aware of the repair works carried out in the estate common areas in the past one-year period before the survey.

### ***Marking scheme for estate management enforcement***

12. Among those PRH households who had heard of the Marking Scheme, about 67% considered that the Marking Scheme could improve the cleanliness and hygienic condition of their estates. About 58% and 54% considered it effective in preventing tenants from throwing objects from height and prohibiting unauthorised dog-keeping in premises respectively. **(Table 10)**

13. On the level of penalty, most of the PRH households considered it reasonable (67%) in general. About 62% and 60% considered it reasonable to allot 5 points for smoking in the estate common areas and illegal gambling in the estate common areas respectively. Besides, some 61% considered it reasonable to allot 5 points for unauthorised dog-keeping in premises. **(Table 10)**

Table 10: Views on Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the Marking Scheme</b>		
Yes	92%	93%
No	8%	7%
<b>Whether the Marking Scheme was effective in the following aspects <sup>(1)</sup></b>		
<u>Improving cleanliness and hygienic condition</u>		
Yes	75%	67%
No	23%	23%
Don't know/No comment	3%	10%
<u>Preventing tenants from throwing objects from height</u>		
Yes	65%	58%
No	32%	34%
Don't know/No comment	4%	8%
<u>Prohibiting unauthorised dog-keeping in premises</u>		
Yes	64%	54%
No	27%	27%
Don't know/No comment	9%	19%
<b>Whether allotting 5 points for the following aspects was reasonable <sup>(1)</sup></b>		
<u>Smoking in estate common areas</u>		
Stringent	10%	16%
Reasonable	72%	62%
Lenient	14%	15%
Don't know/No comment	4%	7%
<u>Illegal gambling in the estate common areas</u>		
Stringent	5%	7%
Reasonable	68%	60%
Lenient	24%	27%
Don't know/No comment	3%	6%
<u>Unauthorised dog-keeping in premises</u>		
Stringent	12%	13%
Reasonable	69%	61%
Lenient	15%	17%
Don't know/No comment	5%	9%
<b>In general, whether the level of penalty was reasonable <sup>(1)</sup></b>		
Stringent	6%	6%
Reasonable	75%	67%
Lenient	16%	20%
Don't know/No comment	3%	7%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

(1) Views were collected from PRH households who had heard of the Marking Scheme.

### ***Reporting abuses of public housing resources***

14. About 82% of the PRH households were aware that HA encouraged tenants to report abuses of public housing resources. Most of them received the message from the mass media (55%). **(Table 11)**

Table 11: Awareness on reporting abuses of public housing resources and the major channels

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the promotion for reporting abuses of public housing resources</b>		
Yes	80%	82%
<i>Major channels</i> <sup>(1)</sup>		
<i>Mass media (TV, newspaper, radio)</i>	43%	55%
<i>Leaflet/Poster/Banner</i>	59%	54%
<i>Advertisement</i>	4%	15%
No	20%	18%

Note: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

15. Most of the PRH households would inform the estate office (54%) or call the HA hotline (39%) if they want to report abuses of public housing resources. **(Table 12)**

Table 12: Preference on the ways of reporting abuses of public housing resources

	2021	2023
<b>Preferred ways to report abuses of public housing resources</b> <sup>(1)</sup>		
Informing the estate office	54%	54%
Calling the HA hotline	34%	39%
Sending in the Tenancy Abuse Report	11%	16%
Aerogramme/Submitting the Online Form		

Note: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

### **(b) Environmental Awareness of PRH Households**

#### ***Utilisation of environmental facilities***

16. About 69% of the PRH households were used to separating household waste for recycling. Among them, most of the households usually disposed of the recyclable waste in the recycling bins located in estates (90%). **(Table 13)**

17. The most common items that PRH households had disposed for recycling were plastic bottles (71%), paper (44%) and aluminium cans (33%). **(Table 13)**

Table 13: Recycling habit

	2021	2023
<b>Whether waste was separated for recycling</b>		
Yes	69%	69%
No	31%	31%
<b>Main channels of the disposal of recyclable waste</b> <sup>(1) (2)</sup>		
Disposal in the recycling bins in estates	95%	90%
Disposal in the recycling bins outside estates	2%	8%
Disposal at the collection points in estates	2%	7%
<b>Most common items disposed for recycling</b> <sup>(1) (2)</sup>		
Plastic bottles	81%	71%
Paper	41%	44%
Aluminium cans	30%	33%

Notes: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

(2) Views were collected from PRH households who were used to separating the waste for recycling.

### ***Awareness of the environmental programme***

18. About 70% of the PRH households had heard about environmental activities organised by HA. **(Table 14)**

Table 14: Awareness of the environmental activities organised by HA

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the environmental activities organised by HA</b>		
Yes	70%	70%
No	30%	30%

### ***Satisfaction towards environmental work in estates***

19. About 61% of the PRH households were satisfied with the performance of the environmental work in their estates. **(Table 15)**

Table 15: Satisfaction towards environmental work in estates

	2021	2023
<b>Performance of environmental work in estates</b>		
Very satisfied/satisfied	62%	61%
Fair	31%	32%
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied	7%	7%

### *Awareness of HA's sustainability performance*

20. On HA's sustainability performance, PRH households were mainly concerned about "cleanliness and hygienic condition in estates" (74%), "estate maintenance" (70%) and "estate facilities" (45%). **(Table 16)**

Table 16: Main issues which PRH households cared about regarding HA's sustainability performance

	2021	2023
<b>Main issues which PRH households cared about regarding HA's sustainability performance <sup>(1)</sup></b>		
Cleanliness and hygienic condition in estates	65%	74%
Estate maintenance	51%	70%
Estate facilities	29%	45%

Note: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

### **(c) Schemes for Fostering Harmonious Families in PRH**

#### *Views from elderly families*

21. Among those PRH households with the principal tenant and/or the spouse aged 60 or above who had children living in private housing, 22% indicated that they would consider making an application under the Harmonious Families Addition Scheme in order to include their children in their PRH tenancies. **(Table 17)**

Table 17: Views of households with elderly tenant(s) who had children living in private housing on the Harmonious Families Addition Scheme

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the scheme</b>		
Yes	40%	36%
No	60%	64%
<b>Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme</b>		
Yes	26%	22%
No	61%	53%
<u>Main reasons for not consider making an application under the scheme <sup>(1)</sup></u>		
<i>Don't want to live together with children</i>	55%	44%
<i>Not qualified</i>	27%	34%
<i>Satisfied with the current living conditions</i>	10%	11%
Don't know/Not decided yet	13%	25%

Note: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

22. For elderly households (i.e. both the principal tenant and the spouse were aged 60 or above) who had children living in other PRH flats, about 6% indicated that they would consider making an application under the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme <sup>Note 8</sup> and about 9% would consider making an application under the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme <sup>Note 9</sup>. **(Tables 18 and 19)**

Table 18: Views of elderly households who had children living in other PRH flats on the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the scheme</b>		
Yes	34%	47%
No	66%	53%
<b>Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme</b>		
Yes	11%	6%
No	66%	75%
<u>Main reasons for not consider making an application under the scheme</u> <sup>(1)</sup>		
Don't want to live together with children	73%	65%
Satisfied with the current living conditions	5%	16%
Don't want to move	19%	14%
Don't know/Not decided yet	23%	19%

Note: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

---

Note 8 The Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme allows the amalgamation of tenancies of younger families with their elderly parents or dependent relatives in PRH. The amalgamated household will be offered a flat of suitable size in any District they prefer subject to availability of resources.

Note 9 The Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme allows PRH tenants residing in different District Council districts from their younger generations/elderly parents to transfer to the same estate or nearby estates.

Table 19: Views of elderly households who had children living in other PRH flats on the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the scheme</b>		
Yes	35%	46%
No	65%	54%
<b>Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme</b>		
Yes	10%	9%
No	65%	69%
<u>Main reasons for not consider making an application under the scheme<sup>(1)</sup></u>		
Don't want to move	43%	40%
Satisfied with the current living conditions	14%	34%
Don't want to live too close to children	28%	22%
Don't know/Not decided yet	25%	21%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

(1) Multiple answers were allowed.

### ***Views from younger families***

23. About 12% of those younger families who had elderly parents living in other PRH flats indicated that they would consider making an application under the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme, while about 22% would consider making an application under the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme. **(Tables 20 and 21)**

Table 20: Views of younger families who had elderly parents living in other PRH flats on the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the scheme</b>		
Yes	72%	51%
No	28%	49%
<b>Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme</b>		
Yes	8%	12%
No	85%	69%
<u>Main reasons for not consider making an application under the scheme<sup>(1)</sup></u>		
Don't want to live with elderly parents	58%	54%
Living nearby currently	2%	20%
Don't want to move	12%	19%
Satisfied with the current living conditions	21%	18%
Don't know/Not decided yet	7%	19%

Note: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

Table 21: Views of younger families who had elderly parents living in other PRH flats on the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme

	2021	2023
<b>Aware of the scheme</b>		
Yes	59%	49%
No	41%	51%
<b>Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme</b>		
Yes	19%	22%
No	69%	58%
<i><u>Main reasons for not consider making an application under the scheme</u><sup>(1)</sup></i>		
<i>Don't want to move</i>	27%	31%
<i>Living nearby currently</i>	22%	30%
<i>Satisfied with the current living conditions</i>	25%	28%
<i>Don't want to live too close to elderly parents</i>	24%	11%
Don't know/Not decided yet	11%	19%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

(1) Multiple answers were allowed.

#### **(d) Views of PRH Households on Rent Payment Methods and Rent Enquiry Services**

##### ***Rent payment methods***

24. The most common rent payment methods used by the PRH households were paying at convenience stores (55%) and autopay (18%). **(Table 22)**



25. Among those who were used to paying rent at estate shroff offices, about 74% indicated that they would pay rent at convenience stores or supermarkets if there was no rent payment service at estate shroff offices. **(Table 22)**

Table 22: Views on rent payment methods

	2021	2023
<b>The most common rent payment methods <sup>(1)</sup></b>		
Convenience stores	53%	55%
Autopay	19%	18%
Estate shroff offices	13%	16%
<b>Preferred method to pay rent if there was no estate shroff offices <sup>(2)</sup></b>		
Convenience stores/Supermarkets	88%	74%
PPS/ATM/Internet/Phone banking	3%	9%
Faster Payment System (FPS) <sup>(3)</sup>	N.A.	4%

Notes: (1) Multiple answers were allowed.

(2) Views were collected from PRH households who were paying rent at estate shroff offices.

(3) This method has been introduced in March 2022.

### ***Rent enquiry services***

26. Among various channels for PRH households to check their rent payment status, about 47% and 11% of households preferred to go to estate shroff offices and convenience stores to check their rent payment status respectively. **(Table 23)**

Table 23: Preferred method of checking rent status

	2021	2023
<b>Preferred method to check the rent status if necessary</b>		
Estate shroff offices	47%	47%
Convenience stores	15%	11%
“iHousing” App	4%	8%

### **III. Future Housing Plans of PRH and SSF Households**

#### **(a) Intention of PRH households to purchase their own TPS flats**

27. Among those PRH households in TPS estates, around 70% are not interested in buying their own TPS flats while some 17% indicated that they would consider so, same as in 2021. Tenants were not interested in buying their own TPS flats mainly due to difficulty to afford the monthly repayment for the mortgage/unstable income/nil income (40%) and old age (23%). A significant proportion (43%) of the authorised population in TPS flats are elderly persons aged 60 and over. It may explain the slower sales of TPS flats in recent years as the tenants are mostly older people who may not be able to afford home ownership even the TPS estates was sold at deep discount with financing facilitation. Apart from the age or income issue, another reason of slower sales of TPS flats may be attributable to the small size of the unsold TPS flats which are less popular to PRH tenants. About 16% of the TPS tenants who are not interested in buying their own flats considered their flats too small. **(Table 24)**

Table 24: Intention of PRH households in TPS estates to purchase their own TPS flats

	<b>2021</b>	<b>2023</b>
<b>Whether the PRH households in TPS estates would consider buying their own TPS flats</b>		
Yes	17%	17%
No	70%	68%
Don't know/Not decided yet	13%	15%

**(b) Intention of PRH households to purchase SSF**

28. The proportion of PRH households indicated that they would consider buying second-hand Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats, new HOS flats, Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (GSH) flats and recovered TPS flats were 14%, 23%, 21% and 25% respectively. **(Table 25)**

Table 25: Intention of PRH households to purchase SSF

	2021	2023
<b>Whether the PRH households would consider buying second-hand HOS flats</b>		
Yes	13%	14%
No	77%	67%
Don't know/Not decided yet	10%	18%
<b>Whether the PRH households would consider buying new HOS flats</b>		
Yes	22%	23%
No	69%	57%
Don't know/Not decided yet	9%	19%
<b>Whether the PRH households would consider buying GSH flats</b>		
Yes	22%	21%
No	67%	58%
Don't know/Not decided yet	11%	21%
<b>Whether the PRH households would consider buying recovered TPS flats</b>		
Yes	23%	25%
No	64%	56%
Don't know/Not decided yet	14%	19%

Note: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

**(c) Intention of SSF owners to sell their flats**

29. Among the SSF owners, only 3% would consider selling their flats within a year. Similar finding was observed for PHRS 2021. **(Table 26)**

Table 26: Intention of SSF owners to sell their flats

	2021	2023
<b>Whether the SSF owners would consider selling their flats within a year</b>		
Yes	3%	3%
No	94%	80%
Don't know/Not decided yet	3%	16%

Note: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

#### **IV. Views on Other Facilities and Services** *(covering PRH and SSF households)*

##### **(a) HA's Shopping Centres**

###### ***Facilities/Services***

30. Generally speaking, about 62% of the shoppers were satisfied with HA's shopping centres. Among various facilities/services, shoppers were most satisfied with the "environment" (69%) and "staff performance" (65%). **(Table 27)**

Table 27: Views <sup>(1)</sup> on HA's shopping centres

	<b>Very satisfied /satisfied</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied /dissatisfied</b>
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<i>Environment (e.g. lighting, hygienic condition)</i>	<i>69%</i>	<i>29%</i>	<i>3%</i>
<i>Staff performance</i>	<i>65%</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>3%</i>
<i>Decoration and maintenance</i>	<i>58%</i>	<i>36%</i>	<i>6%</i>
<i>Promotional activities &amp; decoration for holidays</i>	<i>54%</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>6%</i>

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

- (1) Views were collected from households in public housing who had made purchases at HA's shopping centres within the past one-month period before the survey.

## ***Shops***

31. “Supermarkets” (76%) and “restaurants” (63%) were most frequently visited by the households. The main reason for purchasing at these shops was “convenient location” (88%). Most of the shoppers wanted to have more “restaurants” (32%), “banks” (18%) and “supermarkets” (17%) in their estates/courts. **(Table 28)**

Table 28: Views <sup>(1)</sup> on shops in HA’s shopping centres

	<b>2023</b>
<b>Types of shops that were most frequently visited <sup>(2)</sup></b>	
Supermarkets	76%
Restaurants	63%
Convenience stores	31%
<b>Main reasons for shopping in HA’s shopping centres <sup>(2)</sup></b>	
Convenient location	88%
No alternatives nearby	14%
Competitive pricing	13%
<b>Types of shops that the shoppers wanted to have more <sup>(2)</sup></b>	
Restaurants	32%
Banks	18%
Supermarkets	17%

Notes: (1) Views were collected from households in public housing who had made purchases at HA’s shopping centres within the past one-month period before the survey.

(2) Multiple answers were allowed.

**(b) Car Parking Spaces**

32. Some 12% of the PRH and SSF households had members who were motor vehicle users. Private cars were the most common vehicle type for both PRH (61%) and SSF (71%) households. About 55% of the motor vehicle users parked their vehicles in HA's estates/courts. **(Table 29)**

Table 29: Proportion of households with motor vehicle users, type of vehicles and parking of vehicles

	<b>PRH</b>	<b>SSF</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Proportion of households with motor vehicle users</b>	9%	17%	12%
<b>Type of vehicles</b>			
Private cars	61%	71%	66%
Business cars (e.g. taxi, van and lorry)	27%	19%	23%
Motorcycles	12%	9%	11%
<b>Whether motor vehicle users parked their vehicles in the estates/courts</b>			
Yes	54%	56%	55%
No	46%	44%	45%
<i><u>Main reasons for not parking in the estates/courts<sup>(1)</sup></u></i>			
<i>Parking space in estates/courts was full</i>	49%	47%	48%
<i>Cheaper parking fee elsewhere</i>	32%	31%	31%
<i>No suitable types of parking spaces available</i>	10%	9%	10%
<i>Not responsible for parking their cars</i>	12%	7%	10%

Notes: The percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

(1) Multiple answers were allowed.