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

Public Housing Recurrent Survey 2016

PURPOSE

This paper presents the major findings of the Public Housing Recurrent Survey (PHRS) 2016.

BACKGROUND

2. The PHRS has been conducted annually by the Housing Department since 1992 to collect statistics of socio-economic characteristics of households currently living in the Housing Authority's public housing (including public rental housing (PRH) [Note 1] and subsidised sale flats [Note 2]) as well as their views on a host of housing issues. The sample size of PHRS 2016 was about 5 000 households, comprising 3 000 households in PRH units and 2 000 households in subsidised sale flats [Note 3]. The overall response rate was about 90%.

FINDINGS OF PHRS 2016

------- 3. The major findings of PHRS 2016 are set out at the **Appendix**. Where appropriate, statistics from PHRS conducted in previous years are also presented for comparison purpose. Unless otherwise specified, the statistics presented reflect the position of the first quarter of the respective reference year.

Note 1 PRH units exclude Interim Housing units.

Note 2 Subsidised sale flats include those under the Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS) and the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS), but exclude those that can be traded in open market (i.e. flats sold prior to HOS Phase 3B or flats with premium paid). "HOS" is used as a generic term in this paper, covering also other subsidised home ownership schemes of the Housing Authority, namely, Private Sector Participation Scheme, Middle Income Housing Scheme, Buy or Rent Option Scheme and Mortgage Subsidy Scheme.

Note 3 Including 1 000 households in TPS estates and 1 000 households in HOS courts.

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 : 28 November 2016

Appendix

FINDINGS OF PUBLIC HOUSING RECURRENT SURVEY 2016

(Unless otherwise specified, the statistics presented are at the position of the first quarter of the respective reference year.)

I. Characteristics of Households in Public Rental Housing (PRH), Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS) and Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) Flats

(a) PRH [Note 1]

Number of households

The number of PRH households increased over the past few years. **(Table 1)**

Table 1: Number of PRH households [Note 2]

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
No. of households	701 600	710 200	726 500	730 600	737 400

Household size

2. The average household size was 2.8 persons in 2016. **(Table 2)**

Table 2: Average household size of PRH households

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Average household size	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8

Elderly households [Note 3]

3. The number of elderly households in PRH increased over the past few years. **(Table 3)**

Note 1 Statistics of PRH, including number of households, household size, and number of elderly households, are based on Housing Authority (HA)'s administrative records instead of survey 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 host 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 TPS; demolition of flats in redevelopment projects; letting of vacant flats within existing PRH stock, etc.

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

Table 3: Number of elderly households in PRH

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
No. of elderly households	119 000	123 900	130 300	134 100	137 700

Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA)

4. 17% of the PRH households had members receiving CSSA [Note 4]. **(Table 4)**

Table 4: Proportion of CSSA households in PRH

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
As a proportion of PRH households	21%	20%	19%	18%	17%

(b) TPS

5. The average household size of TPS flats was 3.3 persons in 2016. **(Table 5)**

Table 5: Average household size of TPS households

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Average household size	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3

(c) HOS

6. The average household size of HOS flats was 3.2 persons in 2016. **(Table 6)**

Table 6: Average household size of HOS households

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Average household size	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2

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

II. Opinion on PRH-related Matters

(a) Opinion of PRH Households towards Estate Management

General estate management services

7. The table below shows the views of PRH households towards four aspects of estate management services. Among them, PRH households were most satisfied with the quality of security services (81%). **(Table 7)**

Table 7: Views on general estate management services

	2014	2015	2016
Sense of responsibility of estate officers			
Very satisfied / satisfied	72%	73%	69%
Fair	24%	23%	27%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	4%	4%	4%
Quality of security services			
Very satisfied / satisfied	84%	84%	81%
Fair	15%	14%	17%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	1%	2%	2%
Cleanliness and hygienic condition of common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	75%	74%	70%
Fair	21%	22%	25%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3%	4%	5%
Maintenance-related services in their premises and the estate common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	67%	69%	69%
Fair	23%	22%	23%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	10%	9%	8%

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

Maintenance service for households' premises

8. About 46% of the PRH households had asked 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. 72% of them were satisfied with the overall maintenance services provided. Among the different aspects of maintenance service provided, PRH households were most satisfied with the work attitude of workers (80%). **(Table 8)**

Table 8: Views on maintenance service for PRH households' premises

	2014	2015	2016
Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance requests			
Very satisfied / satisfied	80%	80%	77%
Fair	14%	15%	19%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	6%	5%	4%
Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	77%	79%	73%
Fair	15%	13%	18%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	8%	8%	9%
Work attitude of workers			
Very satisfied / satisfied	82%	83%	80%
Fair	14%	14%	15%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	4%	3%	4%
Quality of works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	65%	68%	68%
Fair	23%	22%	21%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	12%	10%	11%
Improvement of environment after the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	71%	75%	70%
Fair	20%	18%	21%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	9%	7%	9%
Overall maintenance service inside premises			
Very satisfied / satisfied	73%	74%	72%
Fair	22%	19%	23%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	6%	6%	6%

Notes
- Views were collected from PRH households who had asked the HD or the management agent to carry out repair works inside their premises in the past one-year period before the survey.
- Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Maintenance service for estate common areas

9. About 70% 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 9)**

Table 9: Views on maintenance service for estate common areas

	2014	2015	2016
Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance enquiries			
Very satisfied / satisfied	75%	77%	72%
Fair	23%	19%	25%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	2%	4%	3%
Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	65%	65%	59%
Fair	24%	24%	29%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	11%	11%	12%
Maintenance of public facilities (e.g. lift and security system)			
Very satisfied / satisfied	72%	75%	70%
Fair	20%	18%	22%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	8%	6%	8%
Maintenance of estates' outdoor facilities (e.g. playground)			
Very satisfied / satisfied	70%	71%	67%
Fair	25%	23%	27%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	5%	6%	6%
Improvement of environment in common areas after the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	76%	77%	71%
Fair	20%	21%	25%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3%	3%	3%
Overall maintenance service of estate common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	74%	76%	70%
Fair	23%	20%	27%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3%	3%	3%

Notes
- 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.
- Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement

10. Among those PRH households who had heard of the Marking Scheme, about 76% considered that the Marking Scheme could improve the cleanliness and hygienic condition of their estates. Those who held contrary views cited "poor self-discipline of tenants" (35%) as the main reason affecting the effectiveness. On the level of penalty, most of the PRH households considered it reasonable (72%). **(Table 10)**

11. About 55% of PRH households considered the Marking Scheme effective in preventing tenants from throwing objects from height and about 54% considered the Marking Scheme effective in prohibiting unauthorised dog-keeping inside premises. Besides, about 66% considered it reasonable to allot 5 points for illegal gambling in the estate common areas. **(Table 10)**

Table 10: Views on Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement

	2014	2015	2016
Aware of the Marking Scheme			
Yes	94%	93%	94%
No	6%	7%	6%
Whether the Marking Scheme could improve cleanliness and hygienic condition*			
Yes	71%	76%	76%
No	26%	21%	23%
Main reasons for being unable to improve			
Poor self-discipline of tenants	*33%*	*45%*	*35%*
Not enough officers to enforce the scheme	*23%*	*20%*	*24%*
Difficult to catch the culprit	*27%*	*20%*	*22%*
Don't know / No comment	4%	3%	1%
Whether the level of penalty was reasonable*			
Stringent	6%	5%	5%
Reasonable	65%	70%	72%
Lenient	24%	18%	19%
Don't know / No comment	5%	7%	3%
Whether the Marking Scheme was effective in preventing tenants from throwing objects from height*			
Yes	N.A.	57%	55%
No	N.A.	39%	43%
Don't know / No comment	N.A.	4%	2%
Whether the Marking Scheme was effective in prohibiting unauthorized dog-keeping in premises*			
Yes	N.A.	48%	54%
No	N.A.	43%	41%
Don't know / No comment	N.A.	9%	5%
Whether allotting 5 points for illegal gambling in the estate common areas was reasonable*			
Stringent	6%	6%	6%
Reasonable	66%	62%	66%
Lenient	23%	24%	23%
Don't know / No comment	6%	8%	5%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
* Refer to views expressed by PRH households who had heard of the Marking Scheme.
N.A.: Questions on these aspects were not asked in 2014 survey.

Reporting abuses of public housing resources

12. About 73% of the PRH households were aware that the HA encouraged tenants to report abuses of public housing resources. Most of them received the message through the mass media (61%). **(Table 11)**

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

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Aware of the promotion for reporting abuses of public housing resources			
Yes	79%	77%	73%
<u>*Major channels*</u>[#]			
Mass media (TV, newspaper, radio)	*59%*	*64%*	*61%*
Leaflet / Poster / Banner	*40%*	*36%*	*45%*
Friends / Neighbours	*13%*	*9%*	*15%*
No	21%	23%	27%

Multiple answers were allowed.

13. Most of the PRH households would call the Housing Authority (HA) hotline (54%) or inform the estate office (48%) 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

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Preferred ways to report abuses of public housing resources[#]			
Calling the HA hotline	53%	51%	54%
Informing the estate office	45%	44%	48%
Sending in the Tenancy Abuse Report Aerogramme / Submitting the Online Form	8%	8%	9%
Sending in complaint letter	6%	7%	8%

Multiple answers were allowed.

(b) Opinion on Estate Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) *(covering PRH households with EMAC established in their estates)*

Tenants' perception of EMAC

14. On the effectiveness of EMAC, about 53% of the PRH households considered that EMAC's participation in estate management matters could improve the living condition in estates. Besides, about 63% said that the EMAC could enhance PRH households' awareness of and participation in estate management matters, as well as households' communication with the HD. **(Table 13)**

15. About 85% of the PRH households supported the organisation of partnering functions in estates by EMAC with Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Some 71% considered that these functions could promote neighbourliness and effectively enhance households' sense of belonging to the community. **(Table 13)**

Table 13: Opinion on EMAC

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Whether EMAC's participation in estate management matters could improve the living condition in estates			
Yes	53%	48%	53%
No	12%	14%	19%
Don't know / No comment	35%	39%	28%
Whether EMAC could enhance households' awareness of and participation in estate management matters, as well as households' communication with the HD			
Yes	68%	56%	63%
No	13%	18%	22%
Don't know / No comment	19%	26%	15%
Whether organisation of partnering functions in estates by EMAC with NGOs were supported			
Yes	85%	83%	85%
No	4%	6%	7%
Don't know / No comment	10%	11%	8%
Whether organisation of partnering functions with NGOs by EMAC could promote neighbourliness and enhance households' sense of belonging to the community			
Yes	77%	68%	71%
No	11%	17%	19%
Don't know / No comment	12%	16%	10%

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

EMAC Newsletters

16. About 66% of the PRH households considered that the EMAC Newsletters provided useful information on estate management matters. **(Table 14)**

Table 14: Opinion on EMAC Newsletters

	2014	2015	2016
Whether the EMAC Newsletters provided useful information on estate management matters			
Yes	68%	64%	66%
No	16%	17%	24%
Don't know / No comment	16%	19%	9%

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

(c) Environmental Awareness of PRH Households

Utilisation of environmental facilities

17. About 62% 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 (87%). **(Table 15)**

Table 15: Recycling habit

	2014	2015	2016
Whether waste was separated for recycling			
Yes	59%	57%	62%
Main channels of the disposal of recyclable waste#			
Disposal in the recycling bins in estates	*79%*	*81%*	*87%*
Selling to recyclers	*18%*	*16%*	*14%*
Disposal at the collection points in estates	*6%*	*4%*	*7%*
No	41%	43%	38%

Multiple answers were allowed.

18. About 61% of the PRH households had recycled their used clothes in the past six-month period. As for energy conservation measures, about 88% were using compact fluorescent light-bulbs/lamp and about 82% were using appliances/equipment with energy efficiency labels at home. **(Table 16)**

Table 16: Recycling of used clothes and utilisation of environmental devices

	2014	2015	2016
Whether used clothes were recycled in the past six-month period			
Yes	56%	57%	61%
No	43%	42%	38%
Don't remember	1%	1%	0% *
Whether compact fluorescent light bulbs / lamp were used			
Yes	87%	86%	88%
No	11%	12%	11%
Don't remember	2%	2%	2%
Whether appliances / equipment with energy efficiency labels were used			
Yes	78%	78%	82%
No	17%	16%	13%
Don't remember	5%	6%	4%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
* Less than 0.5%

Awareness of the environmental programme

19. About 28% of the PRH households had heard about the long-term environmental programme "Green Delight in Estates" [Note 5]. **(Table 17)**

Table 17: Awareness of the 'Green Delight in Estates' programme

	2014	2015	2016
Yes	40%	36%	28%
No	60%	64%	72%

Awareness of the HA's sustainability performance

20. On HA's sustainability performance, PRH households were mainly concerned about "PRH rent adjustment and rent assistance" (51%), "Cleanliness and hygienic conditions in estates" (50%) and "Estate maintenance" (47%). **(Table 18)**

Note 5 This programme was co-organised by the HA and local green groups. Activities including carnivals and exhibitions were carried out in estates to foster environmental awareness and publicise measures for environment protection among PRH households.

Table 18: Main issues which PRH households cared about regarding HA's sustainability performance

	2014	2015	2016
Main issues which PRH households cared about regarding HA's sustainability performance#			
PRH rent adjustment and rent assistance	46%	51%	51%
Cleanliness and hygienic condition in estates	42%	45%	50%
Estate maintenance	45%	42%	47%
Facilities in estates	22%	23%	29%
Allocation and transfer schemes of PRH flats	17%	20%	21%

Multiple answers were allowed.

(d) 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, 28% 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 19)**

Table 19: Opinion of households with elderly tenant(s) who had offspring living in private housing on the Harmonious Families Addition Scheme

	2014	2015	2016
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	44%	49%	41%
No	56%	51%	59%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	26%	21%	28%
No	61%	66%	61%
Reasons#			
Don't want to live together with offspring	*48%*	*54%*	*55%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*23%*	*25%*	*22%*
Not qualified	*22%*	*15%*	*17%*
Don't know / No comment	13%	13%	11%

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 15% indicated that they would consider making an application under the Harmonious

Families Amalgamation Scheme and about 20% would consider making an application under the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme. **(Tables 20 & 21)**

Table 20: Opinion of elderly households who had children living in other PRH flats on the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme

	2014	2015	2016
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	46%	48%	51%
No	54%	52%	49%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	11%	6%	15%
No	79%	76%	71%
Reasons#			
Don't want to live together with offspring	*61%*	*60%*	*76%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*23%*	*28%*	*13%*
Living nearby currently	*10%*	*6%*	*13%*
Don't know / No comment	10%	18%	13%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Multiple answers were allowed.

Table 21: Opinion of elderly households who had children living in other PRH flats on the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme

	2014	2015	2016
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	45%	47%	47%
No	55%	53%	53%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	12%	15%	20%
No	75%	67%	60%
Reasons#			
Don't want to move	*21%*	*19%*	*30%*
Don't want to live too close to offspring	*27%*	*15%*	*28%*
Living nearby currently	*24%*	*22%*	*24%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*33%*	*39%*	*23%*
Don't know / No comment	13%	18%	20%

Multiple answers were allowed.

Views from younger families

23. About 13% 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 22 & 23)**

Table 22: Opinion of younger families on the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	70%	68%	69%
No	30%	32%	31%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	12%	9%	13%
No	79%	82%	82%
Reasons#			
Don't want to live with elderly parents	*44%*	*51%*	*52%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*36%*	*28%*	*27%*
Living nearby currently	*12%*	*9%*	*13%*
Don't know / No comment	10%	9%	5%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Multiple answers were allowed.

Table 23: Opinion of younger families on the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	64%	67%	64%
No	36%	33%	36%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	20%	19%	22%
No	71%	63%	68%
Reasons#			
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*36%*	*26%*	*33%*
Living nearby currently	*30%*	*29%*	*31%*
Don't want to move	*21%*	*12%*	*22%*
Don't know / No comment	10%	18%	10%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Multiple answers were allowed.

(e) Rent Payment

Rent payment methods

24. The majority (90%) of the PRH households knew about various rent payment methods (e.g. service provided at convenience stores and supermarkets) other than paying rent at estate shroff offices. The most

common rent payment methods used by the PRH households were paying at convenience stores (39%) and estate shroff offices (25%). **(Table 24)**

25. For households who were paying rent at estate shroff offices, the main reason was "convenient location" (63%). About 86% of them indicated that they would pay rent at convenience stores or supermarkets if there was no rent payment service at estate shroff offices. **(Table 24)**

Table 24: Opinion on rent payment methods

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Aware of various rent payment methods other than paying at estate shroff offices			
Yes	86%	87%	90%
No	14%	13%	10%
The most common rent payment methods#			
Convenience stores	38%	38%	39%
Estate shroff offices	26%	26%	25%
Autopay	19%	19%	19%
Direct rent payment for CSSA households	19%	19%	18%
Main reasons for paying rent at estate shroff offices* #			
Convenient location	64%	55%	63%
Getting used to paying rent at estate shroff offices	29%	33%	37%
Detailed invoice issued	26%	22%	21%
Alternative methods to adopt if there were no estate shroff offices* #			
Convenience stores / Supermarkets^	86%	83%	86%
Autopay	20%	30%	32%
PPS / ATM / Internet / Phone banking	19%	23%	31%

Multiple answers were allowed.
* Refer to views expressed by PRH households who were paying rent at estate shroff offices.
^ The percentages for the 2014 survey also covered the alternative method of paying rent at MTR Customer Service Centres but this service is no longer available.

Rent Enquiry Services

26. The HA provides rent enquiry services for tenants to check their rent payment status through various channels in addition to the estate offices, including the Rent Enquiry Hotline, Rent Enquiry Kiosk, Rent Enquiry e-Service and checking services at 7-Eleven. Among the four channels, PRH households were most aware of the services provided at 7-Eleven (40%). To check the rent status, most households would go to 7-Eleven (46%). **(Table 25)**

Table 25: Opinion on the HA Rent Enquiry Services provided by various channels

	Rent Enquiry Hotline	Rent Enquiry Kiosk	Rent Enquiry e-Service	7-Eleven
Aware of the rent enquiry services provided by various channels				
Yes	21%	37%	27%	40%
No	79%	63%	73%	60%
Intention of using the rent enquiry services to check the rent status if necessary				
Yes	40%	40%	30%	46%
No	55%	55%	66%	51%
Main reasons for not using the enquiry services#				
Rent payment particulars are already provided on the payment receipts or passbook	*49%*	*52%*	*36%*	*54%*
Lack of computing knowledge / No computer	*N.A. **	*N.A. **	*35%*	*N.A. **
More convenient to enquire through the estate offices	*17%*	*13%*	*12%*	*22%*
Complicated procedures	*14%*	*17%*	*23%*	*N.A.**
Don't know / No comment	5%	6%	4%	3%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Multiple answers were allowed.
* "Lack of computing knowledge / No computer" was not applicable to Rent Enquiry Hotline, Kiosk and 7-Eleven while "Complicated procedures" was not applicable to Rent Enquiry service at 7-Eleven.

(f) Ownership of Bicycles of PRH Households

27. About 13% of the PRH households owned bicycles. The proportion of PRH households owning bicycles in the New Territories (26%) was higher than those in Extended Urban District (16%) and Urban District (6%). **(Table 26)**

Table 26: PRH households' bicycle ownership

	Urban	Extended Urban	New Territories	Overall
Yes	6%	16%	26%	13%
No	94%	84%	74%	87%

28. PRH households used their bicycles mainly for leisure (85%). On parking, the majority of them kept the bicycles inside their premises (79%). **(Table 27)**

Table 27: Major usage and parking of bicycles

	Proportion
Major usage of bicycles#	
Leisure	85%
Commuting purposes	19%
Parking of bicycles#	
Inside their flats	79%
Bicycle parking lots in estates	18%

Multiple answers were allowed.

III. Future Housing Plans of PRH and HOS Households

(a) Intention of PRH households to purchase unsold TPS flats

29. Among those PRH households who were currently living in TPS estates, around 19% indicated that they would consider buying their own TPS flats. **(Table 28)**

Table 28: Intention of tenants who were living in TPS estates to purchase their own flats

	2014	2015	2016
Whether tenants living in TPS estates would consider buying their own TPS flats			
Yes	23%	23%	19%
No	65%	59%	71%
Not decided yet	12%	18%	10%

(b) Intention of PRH households to purchase HOS flats

30. 60% of the PRH households were aware of the HOS Secondary Market Scheme (SMS). About 12% of the PRH households indicated that they would consider buying second-hand HOS flats either in the HOS Secondary Market or in the open market. About 15% of the PRH households would consider buying new HOS flats. **(Table 29)**

31. 58% of the PRH households heard about the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Pilot Scheme (GSH). About 12% of the PRH households indicated that they would consider applying for GSH. **(Table 29)**

Table 29: PRH households' intention of purchasing HOS and GSH flats

	2014	2015	2016
Whether PRH households were aware of the SMS (i.e. purchase of second-hand HOS flats with premium not yet paid)			
Yes	64%	67%	60%
No	36%	33%	40%
Whether PRH households would consider buying second-hand HOS flats (in the HOS Secondary Market or in the open market)			
Yes	14%	11%	12%
No	82%	80%	82%
Not decided yet	4%	9%	5%
Whether PRH households would consider buying new HOS flats			
Yes	8%	11%	15%
No	83%	80%	79%
Not decided yet	9%	9%	6%
Whether PRH households knew about GSH			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	58%
No	N.A.	N.A.	42%
Whether PRH households would consider applying for GSH			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	12%
No	N.A.	N.A.	80%
Not decided yet	N.A.	N.A.	8%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
N.A.: Questions on these aspects were not asked in the 2014 and 2015 surveys.

(c) Intention of HOS flat owners to sell their flats

32. 41% of the HOS flat owners were aware of the procedures for selling HOS flats. The major channels from which they obtained the information were the mass media (39%) and the HA website (24%). Some 70% were aware that it was not necessary for them to pay premium to the HA for sale of flats under the SMS. About 1% of the HOS flat owners indicated that they would consider selling their flats within a year either in the HOS Secondary Market or in the open market. **(Table 30)**

Table 30: HOS flat owners' intention of selling their flats

	2014	2015	2016
Whether HOS flat owners were aware of the procedures for selling HOS flats			
Yes	36%	36%	41%
Major channels to obtain the information#			
Mass media	*32%*	*31%*	*39%*
HA website	*11%*	*17%*	*24%*
Sales brochure of HOS flats	*26%*	*29%*	*21%*
No	64%	64%	59%
Whether HOS flat owners were aware that it was not necessary to pay premium for sale of their flats in the HOS Secondary Market			
Yes	66%	70%	70%
No	34%	30%	30%
Whether HOS flat owners would consider selling their flats within a year			
Yes	1%	2%	1%
No	96%	97%	97%
Not decided yet	3%	2%	3%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Multiple answers were allowed.

IV. Opinion on Other Facilities and Services *(covering PRH, TPS and HOS households)*

(a) HA's Shopping Centres / Market Stalls

Facilities

33. Generally speaking, about 74% of the shoppers were satisfied with the facilities in HA's shopping centres/market stalls. Among various facilities/services, shoppers were most satisfied with the "lighting" (78%) and "air conditioning" (78%). **(Table 31)**

Table 31: Views on facilities in HA's shopping centres / market stalls

	Very satisfied / satisfied	**Fair**	**Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied**
Overall Satisfaction	**74%**	**24%**	**1%**
Lighting	*78%*	*19%*	*4%*
Air conditioning	*78%*	*17%*	*5%*
Corridor (e.g. layout, accessibility)	*74%*	*22%*	*4%*
Opening hours	*74%*	*21%*	*5%*
Fire safety installation	*71%*	*27%*	*2%*
Map and directory	*71%*	*26%*	*3%*
Hygienic condition	*71%*	*24%*	*5%*
Security	*70%*	*27%*	*3%*
Maintenance	*70%*	*26%*	*4%*
Promotional activities & decoration for holidays	*69%*	*27%*	*4%*
Handling enquiries & complaints	*65%*	*32%*	*3%*
Design and decoration of shops	*61%*	*35%*	*4%*

Notes:
- Views were collected from households in public housing who had made purchases at the HA's retail facilities within the past one-month period before the survey.
- Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Shops

34. The most frequently visited shops were "supermarkets" (72%), "market stalls" (48%) and "restaurants" (41%). The most common reason for purchasing at these shops was "convenient location" (82%). Most of the shoppers wanted to have more restaurants (30%), market stalls (27%) and banks (15%). **(Table 32)**

Table 32: Opinion on shops in HA's shopping centres / market stalls

	Proportion
Types of shops that were most frequently visited#	
Supermarkets	72%
Market stalls	48%
Restaurants	41%
Main reasons for shopping in HA's shopping centres / market stalls#	
Convenient location	82%
Competitive pricing	12%
No alternatives nearby	12%
Types of shops that the shoppers wanted to have more#	
Restaurants	30%
Market stalls	27%
Banks	15%

Note: Views were collected from households in public housing who had made purchases at the HA's retail facilities within the past one-month period before the survey.

Multiple answers were allowed.

(b) Car Parking Spaces

35. Some 14% of the PRH, TPS and HOS households had members who were motor vehicle users. In terms of the vehicle type, business cars (e.g. taxi, van and lorry) were the most common vehicle type for PRH (59%) and TPS (49%) households, while private cars were the most common vehicle type for HOS households (57%). **(Table 33)**

Table 33: Proportion of households who had motor vehicle users and the distribution of vehicle types

	PRH	TPS	HOS	Overall
Proportion of households with motor vehicle users	10%	18%	22%	14%
Type of vehicles				
Business cars (e.g. taxi, van and lorry)	59%	49%	41%	51%
Private cars	35%	43%	57%	44%
Motorcycles	6%	8%	3%	5%

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

36. Overall speaking, about 40% of the motor vehicle users parked their vehicles in the estates/courts. The relevant statistics are set out in the table below. **(Table 34)**

Table 34: Parking of motor vehicle in public housing

	PRH	TPS	HOS	Overall
Whether motor vehicle users parked their vehicles in the estates/courts				
Yes	35%	39%	47%	40%
No	65%	61%	53%	60%
Main reasons #				
Not responsible for parking their cars	*28%*	*26%*	*34%*	*30%*
Parking elsewhere due to job-related requirements	*25%*	*16%*	*17%*	*21%*
Vehicles were in 24-hour operation (e.g. taxi)	*21%*	*16%*	*16%*	*19%*
Cheaper parking fee elsewhere	*12%*	*19%*	*12%*	*13%*
Parking space in estates / courts was full	*10%*	*19%*	*14%*	*13%*

Multiple answers were allowed.

(c) Handling of Enquiries / Complaints

37. Some 25% of the households had made enquiries/complaints to the HA during the past one-year period before the survey. Most of them raised issues relating to estate/court management matters (89%). About 56% of these households were satisfied with the services provided by the HA in handling enquiries/complaints. On major areas of improvement, the households suggested that improvement in the efficiency of handling enquiries/complaints (37%) and the service quality of the staff (28%) were needed. **(Table 35)**

Table 35: Opinion on handling enquiries / complaints

	2014	2015	2016
Main subjects of households' enquiries / complaints#			
Estate / court management matters	88%	88%	89%
Application for public housing	7%	6%	6%
Rent related / tenancy matters (applicable to PRH only)	4%	4%	3%
Whether the households were satisfied with the HA enquiry / complaint service			
Very satisfied / satisfied	53%	54%	56%
Fair	22%	21%	22%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	24%	25%	21%
Major areas of improvement#			
No comment	37%	43%	41%
Efficiency	35%	35%	37%
Service quality of staff	18%	23%	28%

Notes
- Views were collected from households in public housing who had made enquiries or complaints within the past one-year period before the survey.
- Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Multiple answers were allowed.