

THE HONG KONG HOUSING AUTHORITY

Memorandum for the Housing Authority

Household Profile in Public Housing

PURPOSE

This paper presents the latest socio-economic characteristics of households living in public housing derived from the 1998/99 Recurrent Survey.

BACKGROUND

2. In formulating and reviewing public housing policies, information on the socio-economic characteristics of households is very useful. As such, the Department conducts a recurrent survey annually to keep track of these statistics. This paper presents the findings of the latest survey regarding household size, household income, living density, rent and rent-to-income/mortgage-to-income ratios amongst public rental housing (PRH), Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS) and Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) households.

3. This survey was conducted between January and February 1999 and covered a random sample of 2,800 PRH, 200 TPS and 1,000 HOS households, making a total of 4,000 households. 3,671 households were successfully enumerated. All the findings illustrated below were derived from the survey.

FINDINGS

Households in General

4. The average household size for different groups of households in public housing were -

- (a) PRH : 3.7 persons
- (b) TPS : 4.2 persons
- (c) HOS : 3.7 persons

5. In terms of household composition, the majority of households comprised one family nucleus, i.e., married couples with or without children or single parent households. The latest distribution was -

	Households with one family nucleus	Households with one extended family nucleus i.e. a family nucleus with other related persons	Household with two or more family nuclei	1p households	Other Non-family-nucleus households
(a) PRH	66.6%	14.3%	6.4%	9.3%	3.3%
(b) TPS	82.2%	10.3%	6.1%	1%	0.5%
(c) HOS	74.9%	12.5%	7.5%	2.2%	2.9%

6. The medium living density of the three groups of households were -

- (a) PRH : 8.8 m² Internal Floor (IFA) per person
- (b) TPS : 10.3 m² IFA per person
- (c) HOS : 12.9 m² IFA per person

7. As regards the median monthly household income, the HOS households earned the most -

- (a) PRH : \$13,000
- (b) TPS : \$16,250
- (c) HOS : \$21,750

8. For PRH households, their median rent was \$1,200 while 75% of tenants paid less than \$1,500. The corresponding median rent-to-income ratio (MRIR) was 9.2%. For the additional rent paying households, their median rent was \$2,000 while the MRIR was 6.4%.

9. For home owners in the public sector, the majority still had to pay mortgages for their homes, and the median monthly mortgage payment and the median mortgage-to-income ratio (MMIR) for those with outstanding mortgage were -

	Proportion still had to pay mortgages	Median monthly mortgage payment	MMIR
(a) TPS	55.9%	\$2,300	13.1%
(b) HOS	63.7%	\$6,200	25.3%

Newly Rehoused Households

10. In the Recurrent Survey, we had particularly looked into the living conditions and housing costs of households rehoused in PRH and HOS for less than four years. The key findings were summarized below.

11. For PRH households, their key characteristics were -

- (a) In terms of origin, 47.7% of the newly rehoused households lived in PRH before rehousing. 31.4% and 16% previously lived in private permanent housing and temporary housing areas/cottage areas respectively. 2% lived in private temporary structures before.
- (b) Nearly 80% of the newly rehoused households said that their living conditions had improved after rehousing. Improvements in the following aspects are worth-noting -
 - (i) 83% of households were now living in larger flats. Their median living density had increased significantly from 5.8 m² IFA to 10.8 m² IFA per person.
 - (ii) 39% of respondents lived in non-self-contained flats, temporary structures or shared accommodations previously.
- (c) 63% of these households spent a higher proportion of their incomes on rent. Their MRIR increased from 8% to 13.2%. However, households who previously lived in private permanent housing experienced a marked reduction in their MRIR, from 25% to 12.3%.

- (d) 13.2% of these households claimed that they had applied for HOS before rehousing.
- (e) For those households who had not considered to buy HOS before, their main reasons were “affordability problems” (66.2%), and “low PRH rents” (30.3%). Their median household income was \$10,200.

12. For HOS households, their key characteristics were -

- (a) About 55.8% of these newly rehoused households lived in PRH before. 32.6% lived in private permanent housing previously while 1.5% lived in Housing Society rental flats before.
- (b) Nearly 80% of these households said that their living conditions had improved. Most of them (84.2%) were now living in larger flats. Their living density increased significantly from 9.1 m² IFA to 13.6 m² IFA per person.
- (c) 91.6% of the home owners still had to pay mortgages for their homes. For those with outstanding mortgages, their median monthly mortgage payment was \$9,000 while the corresponding MMIR was 33.9%.

13. A trend analysis on the outcome of recurrent surveys conducted between 1991/92 and 1998/99 is at **Annex** for reference.

INFORMATION

14. This paper is for Members' information.

c.c. Members of Rental Housing and Home Ownership Committees

File Ref. : HD 2143/21 III8

Date : 3 July 1999