

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

Public Housing Recurrent Survey 2011

PURPOSE

This paper presents the main findings of the Public Housing Recurrent Survey (PHRS) for 2011.

BACKGROUND

2. The PHRS has been conducted annually by the Housing Department (HD) since 1992. The sample size of PHRS 2011 was about 5 000 households, comprising 3 000 households in Public Rental Housing (PRH) flats, 1 000 in Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS) estates and 1 000 in Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) courts. The overall response rate was about 90%.

FINDINGS OF PHRS 2011

----- 3. The main findings of PHRS 2011 are set out at **Annex**. The statistics for PHRS conducted in previous years are also presented for comparison purpose where appropriate.

INFORMATION

4. Members are invited to note the findings of PHRS 2011 at the **Annex**.

Ms Cindy CHAN
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 : 12 August 2011

FINDINGS OF PUBLIC HOUSING RECURRENT SURVEY 2011

Characteristics of Households in Public Rental Housing (Based on administrative records)

Number of households

The number of PRH households was increasing over the past few years.
(Table 1)

Table 1: Number of PRH households

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
No. of households	647 700	648 000	664 400	679 800	687 000

Household size

2. The average household size decreased from 3.1 in 2007 to 2.9 in 2011.
(Table 2)

Table 2: Average household size of PRH households

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Average household size	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9

Elderly households

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

Table 3: Number of elderly households in PRH

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
No. of elderly households	95 600	98 100	103 000	108 500	113 500

Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA)

4. The percentage of households with members receiving CSSA was 22%. (Table 4)

Table 4: Proportion of CSSA households in PRH

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
As a proportion of PRH households	21%	19%	22%	22%	22%

Opinion towards Estate Management

General estate management services

5. Over the past few years, PRH households' satisfaction levels on various aspects of estate management services improved. For this year, the proportion of 'Very satisfied / satisfied' ranged from 69% to 81%. (Table 5)

Table 5: Views on general estate management services

	2009	2010	2011
Sense of responsibility of estate officers			
Very satisfied / satisfied	66.1%	67.7%	68.8%
Fair	28.9%	27.2%	26.6%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	4.9%	5.1%	4.5%
Quality of security services			
Very satisfied / satisfied	78.2%	79.8%	80.9%
Fair	19.6%	18.0%	17.8%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	2.1%	2.2%	1.3%
Cleanliness and hygienic conditions of common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	69.2%	71.8%	73.8%
Fair	26.8%	23.5%	23.5%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	4.0%	4.6%	2.7%
Overall maintenance-related services in their premises and the estate common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	61.1%	63.9%	68.8%
Fair	28.3%	26.4%	22.1%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	10.7%	9.7%	9.1%

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

Maintenance service for households' premises

6. Around half (52%) of PRH households had asked the Department or the management agent to carry out repair works inside their premises in the past 12 months. Overall speaking, 67% were satisfied with the maintenance services provided. (Table 6)

Table 6: Views on maintenance service for PRH households' premises

	2009	2010	2011
Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance requests			
Very satisfied / satisfied	72.1%	70.5%	72.4%
Fair	20.3%	21.7%	21.0%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	7.6%	7.8%	6.6%
Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	71.9%	72.3%	74.6%
Fair	18.4%	17.8%	18.0%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	9.7%	9.9%	7.4%
Work attitude of workers			
Very satisfied / satisfied	74.7%	75.2%	76.4%
Fair	19.3%	19.4%	18.1%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	6.0%	5.3%	5.5%
Quality of works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	51.7%	57.1%	62.4%
Fair	32.5%	28.2%	23.6%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	15.8%	14.7%	14.0%
Improvement of environment after the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	N.A.	N.A.	66.0%
Fair	N.A.	N.A.	21.4%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	N.A.	N.A.	12.6%
Overall maintenance service inside premises			
Very satisfied / satisfied	65.0%	67.1%	66.8%
Fair	25.8%	24.4%	24.2%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	9.2%	8.5%	9.0%

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

N.A.: Data not available as questions on these aspects were not asked.

Maintenance service for estate common areas

7. As regards the maintenance works conducted in estate common areas, 63% to 72% of PRH households were very satisfied / satisfied with various aspects of the service. (Table 7)

Table 7: Views on maintenance service for estate common areas

	2009	2010	2011
Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance enquiries			
Very satisfied / satisfied	66.4%	66.1%	65.5%
Fair	29.3%	30.5%	32.1%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	4.3%	3.4%	2.4%
Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	60.4%	59.6%	62.6%
Fair	28.9%	30.4%	27.0%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	10.7%	10.0%	10.4%
Maintenance of public facilities (e.g. lift and security system)			
Very satisfied / satisfied	69.5%	69.0%	71.7%
Fair	23.3%	24.3%	21.8%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	7.1%	6.7%	6.5%
Maintenance of estates' outdoor facilities (e.g. playground)			
Very satisfied / satisfied	63.8%	64.6%	66.6%
Fair	29.7%	29.8%	28.3%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	6.5%	5.6%	5.0%
Improvement of environment in common areas after the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	N.A.	N.A.	72.3%
Fair	N.A.	N.A.	24.9%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	N.A.	N.A.	2.8%
Overall maintenance service for estate common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	63.9%	66.3%	68.3%
Fair	32.5%	30.0%	29.5%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3.6%	3.7%	2.2%

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

N.A.: Data not available as questions on these aspects were not asked.

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement

8. Majority (75%) of the PRH households considered that the Marking Scheme could improve the cleanliness and hygienic conditions of their estates. Those who held contrary views cited poor self-discipline of tenants (45%) and not enough officers to enforce the Scheme (25%) as the main reasons against the effectiveness. On the level of penalty, 67% considered it reasonable; 22%, lenient; and 7%, stringent. Furthermore, 74% considered it reasonable to prohibit households evicted under the Marking Scheme from applying for PRH again for a period of two years. (Table 8).

9. Regarding the introduction of a fixed penalty system for smoking offence effective from September 2009, 88% supported the measure. With effect from November 2003, tenants who keep prohibited dog(s) or animal(s) inside leased premises without prior written consent of the Landlord will be allotted penalty points under the Marking Scheme. Over half (58%) of PRH households agreed that the measure was effective. (Table 8)

Table 8: Views on Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement

	2009	2010	2011
Aware of the Scheme			
Yes	97.2%	97.2%	96.6%
No	2.8%	2.8%	3.4%
Whether the Scheme can improve cleanliness*			
Yes	74.8%	76.1%	75.1%
No	23.7%	21.8%	21.3%
<i>Reasons for being unable to improve cleanliness#</i>			
<i>Poor self-discipline of tenants</i>	35.1%	35.0%	44.7%
<i>Not enough officers to enforce the Scheme</i>	19.4%	18.0%	24.8%
<i>Difficult to catch the culprit</i>	27.7%	29.0%	16.5%
<i>Deterrent effect not strong enough</i>	15.0%	14.4%	13.1%
Don't know / No comment	1.5%	2.1%	3.6%
Whether the level of penalty is reasonable*			
Stringent	8.6%	6.2%	7.2%
Reasonable	65.4%	71.5%	67.0%
Lenient	24.2%	20.7%	22.3%
Don't know / No comment	1.9%	1.7%	3.5%
Whether considered reasonable to prohibit households evicted under the Marking Scheme from applying for PRH again within 2 years*			
Stringent	20.2%	11.7%	16.0%
Reasonable	72.4%	79.4%	73.6%
Lenient	5.6%	7.0%	7.3%
Don't know / No comment	1.8%	1.9%	3.0%
Whether supported the fixed penalty system for smoking offence implemented by the Department's officers within the estate areas			
Yes	N.A.	93.0%	87.8%
No	N.A.	5.3%	7.8%
Don't know / No comment	N.A.	1.6%	4.5%
Whether considered effective to prohibit tenants from keeping dogs under the Marking Scheme			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	57.7%
No	N.A.	N.A.	35.0%
Don't know / No comment	N.A.	N.A.	7.3%

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

* Refer to views expressed by PRH households who knew about the scheme.

Multiple answers were allowed.

N.A.: Data not available as questions on these aspects were not asked.

Reporting abuses of public housing resources

10. About 73% of PRH households were aware of the need to report abuses of public housing resources. Most of them got the message through the mass media (64%) and leaflet / poster / banner (45%). (Table 9)

Table 9: Awareness on reporting abuses of public housing resources and the major channels

	2010	2011
Whether households were aware of reporting abuses of public housing resources		
Yes	65.6%	73.4%
<i>Major channels[#]</i>		
<i>Mass media (TV, newspaper, radio)</i>	65.2%	63.8%
<i>Leaflet / Poster / Banner</i>	30.2%	45.1%
<i>Friends / Neighbours</i>	15.6%	12.1%
<i>Newsletter</i>	11.5%	7.5%
No	34.4%	26.6%

Multiple answers were allowed.

Opinion on Estate Management Advisory Committee (EMAC)

Tenants' perception of EMAC

11. On the responsibilities of EMAC, households were most concerned about estate management matters like 'maintenance works' (65%), 'security' (60%) and 'cleansing' (57%). Some 76% of PRH households agreed that tenants' participation in EMAC could improve estate management. (Table 10)

Table 10: Opinion on EMAC

	2009	2010	2011
Aware of EMAC			
Yes	35.7%	36.7%	37.1%
No	64.3%	63.3%	62.9%
Most important roles of EMAC as perceived by PRH households[#]			
Maintenance works in the estates	62.6%	65.0%	65.1%
Security in the estates	56.5%	58.8%	60.2%
Cleansing of the estates	54.7%	55.2%	57.3%
Whether agreed that tenants' participation in EMAC could improve estate management			
Yes	82.4%	83.1%	76.1%
No	8.5%	8.6%	9.3%
Don't know / No comment	9.1%	8.3%	14.5%

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

Multiple answers were allowed.

EMAC Newsletters

12. Of those PRH households who had received the EMAC newsletters, 83% expressed that the newsletters provided useful information on estate management matters. (Table 11)

Table 11: Opinion on 'EMAC Newsletter'

	2009	2010	2011
Whether households had received 'EMAC Newsletter'			
Yes	58.3%	68.2%	65.2%
<i>Whether the newsletter is informative</i>			
<i>Yes</i>	84.7%	86.0%	82.5%
<i>No</i>	10.8%	10.8%	11.9%
<i>Don't know / No comment</i>	4.4%	3.2%	5.6%
No	32.5%	25.8%	25.6%
Don't know / Don't remember	9.2%	6.0%	9.2%

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

Environmental Awareness of PRH Households

Utilisation of environmental facilities

13. Among all the PRH households, 48% had used the recycling bins located in the estates in the past one month. Half of the PRH households had disposed of their used clothes for recycling in the past 6 months. As for measures of energy conservation, 81% were using compact fluorescent light-bulbs and 64% were using appliances / equipments with energy efficiency labels at home. (Table 12)

Table 12: Utilisation of environmental facilities

	2009	2010	2011
Whether used the recycling bins in the past 1 month			
Yes	51.4%	53.5%	48.2%
No	46.4%	44.9%	47.6%
Don't remember	2.2%	1.6%	4.2%
Whether recycled used clothes in the past 6 months			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	49.9%
No	N.A.	N.A.	49.4%
Don't remember	N.A.	N.A.	0.7%
Whether using the compact fluorescent light bulbs			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	80.5%
No	N.A.	N.A.	18.5%
Don't remember	N.A.	N.A.	1.0%
Whether using the appliances and equipments with energy efficiency labels			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	64.2%
No	N.A.	N.A.	28.6%
Don't remember	N.A.	N.A.	7.1%

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

N.A.: Data not available as questions on these aspects were not asked.

Awareness of the environmental programme

14. Some 24% of PRH households had heard about the long-term environmental programme 'Green Delight in Estates'¹ launched by the Department. 17% had participated in some promotional activities. (Table 13)

¹ This programme was co-organised by the Housing Department and local green groups. Activities including carnivals and exhibitions were carried out in estates to foster environmental awareness among PRH households and publicize measures for environmental protection (e.g. waste reduction and energy saving).

Table 13: Awareness of the ‘Green Delight in Estates’ programme and tenants’ participation

	2009	2010	2011
Aware of the ‘Green Delight in Estates’ programme			
Yes	21.2%	29.6%	24.2%
No	78.8%	70.4%	75.8%
Whether participated in the promotional activities in estates			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	16.9%
No	N.A.	N.A.	83.1%
<i><u>Main reasons for not participated[#]</u></i>			
<i>Don’t have time</i>	N.A.	N.A.	41.5%
<i>Not aware of these activities</i>	N.A.	N.A.	35.6%
<i>Not interested</i>	N.A.	N.A.	20.2%
<i>Old age</i>	N.A.	N.A.	13.0%

Multiple answers were allowed.

N.A.: Data not available as questions on these aspects were not asked.

Schemes for Fostering Harmonious Families in Public Housing

Views from elderly families

15. Among elderly families (i.e. principal tenant and/or the spouse aged 60 or above) in PRH who had offspring living in the private housing, 27% were interested to apply for the Harmonious Families Addition Scheme so as to include their children into their PRH tenancies. (Table 14)

Table 14: Opinion of elderly families, who had offspring living in private housing, on Harmonious Families Addition Scheme

	2010	2011
Aware of the scheme		
Yes	42.0%	45.4%
No	58.0%	54.6%
Interest in applying for the scheme		
Yes	22.1%	26.7%
No	66.2%	67.7%
<i><u>Main reasons for not applying[#]</u></i>		
<i>Don’t want to live together with offspring</i>	49.4%	64.3%
<i>Satisfied with the current living conditions</i>	24.3%	19.6%
<i>Not qualified</i>	1.7%	10.2%
<i>Preference of districts of residence are different between young and elderly family members</i>	7.1%	7.4%
Don’t know / No comment	11.7%	5.6%

Multiple answers were allowed.

16. For those elderly families who had children living in other PRH flats, 5% were interested in applying for the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme and 17% for the Transfer Scheme. (Table 15)

Table 15: Opinion of elderly families (both the principal tenant and the spouse aged 60 or above), who had children living in other PRH flats, on Harmonious Families Amalgamation and Transfer Schemes

	Amalgamation Scheme		Transfer Scheme	
	2010	2011	2010	2011
Aware of the scheme				
Yes	46.8%	43.2%	50.2%	45.7%
No	53.2%	56.8%	49.8%	54.3%
Interest in applying for the scheme				
Yes	7.4%	4.5%	12.8%	16.7%
No	90.1%	87.7%	82.1%	71.0%
<i><u>Main reasons for not applying[#]</u></i>				
<i>Don't want to live together with offspring</i>	52.9%	66.0%	N.A.	N.A.
<i>Living nearby currently</i>	14.8%	18.4%	19.8%	36.2%
<i>Satisfied with the current living conditions</i>	20.1%	9.8%	27.9%	34.7%
<i>Don't want to move</i>	12.6%	7.9%	33.3%	17.9%
<i>Don't want to live too close to offspring</i>	N.A.	N.A.	24.0%	14.9%
Don't know / No comment	2.5%	7.8%	5.2%	12.3%

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

Multiple answers were allowed.

N.A.: The participants of the Transfer Scheme would only live in the locality, not together in a flat. Under the Amalgamation Scheme participants would live together in a flat.

Views from younger families

17. For younger families, 11% of those who had elderly parents living in other PRH flats were interested in applying for the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme. A higher proportion was interested in applying for the Transfer Scheme (18%). (Table 16)

Table 16: Opinion of younger families on Harmonious Families Amalgamation and Transfer Schemes

	Amalgamation Scheme		Transfer Scheme	
	2010	2011	2010	2011
Aware of the schemes				
Yes	63.5%	74.7%	53.5%	64.9%
No	36.5%	25.3%	46.5%	35.1%
Interest in applying for the schemes				
Yes	14.8%	11.5%	21.2%	18.4%
No	84.1%	81.4%	73.6%	73.8%
<i>Main reasons for not applying[#]</i>				
<i>Don't want to live with elderly parents</i>	44.6%	48.9%	N.A.	N.A.
<i>Satisfied with the current living conditions</i>	35.6%	24.4%	37.8%	31.3%
<i>Living nearby currently</i>	11.5%	16.6%	26.0%	31.2%
<i>Don't want to live too close to elderly parents</i>	N.A.	N.A.	16.5%	19.0%
<i>Don't want to move</i>	16.2%	10.2%	27.9%	12.3%
Don't know / No comment	1.2%	7.1%	5.2%	7.7%

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

Multiple answers were allowed.

N.A.: The participants of the Transfer Scheme would only live in the locality, not together in a flat. Under the Amalgamation Scheme participants would live together in a flat.

Ownership of Bicycles of PRH Households

18. About 10% of PRH households owned bicycles. The percentage for the New Territories (21%) was higher than that for Extended Urban (12%) and Urban (3%) areas. (Table 17)

Table 17: Ownership of bicycles in PRH estates

	Urban	Extended Urban	NT	Overall
Yes	3.4%	11.8%	21.2%	10.2%
No	96.6%	88.2%	78.8%	89.8%

19. On the whole, 81% and 24% of bicycle owners used their bicycles for leisure and commuting purposes respectively. On parking, 22% of the households parked in the bicycle parking lots of their estates. 76% kept them inside their premises. (Table 18)

Table 18: Usage and parking of bicycles

	Proportion
Usage of bicycles[#]	
Leisure	80.8%
Commuting purposes	23.5%
Parking of bicycle[#]	
Inside their flats	75.7%
Bicycle parking lots in estates	21.5%

Multiple answers were allowed.

Shopping Behaviour of Residents (covering households of PRH, TPS HOS)

Shopping in HA's shopping centres / market stalls

20. Among those households residing in estates / courts with HA's retail facilities, 86% of them had visited these shopping centres / market stalls recently.

21. The most popular kinds of shop were 'supermarkets' (71%), followed by 'market stalls' (50%) and 'restaurants' (40%). The most common reason for visiting these shops was 'convenient location' (79%). The shoppers expressed that they wanted to have more restaurants (45%) and market stalls (44%). (Table 19)

Table 19: Opinion on variety of shops in HA's shopping centres / market stalls

	Proportion
Popularity of shops[#]	
Supermarkets	71.5%
Market stalls	49.5%
Restaurants	40.3%
Convenience stores	12.7%
Reasons for shopping in HA's shopping centres / market stalls[#]	
Convenient location	78.7%
Competitive pricing	13.6%
No alternatives nearby	10.8%
Variety of products	7.0%
Types of shops considered insufficient[#]	
Restaurants	44.5%
Market stalls	44.2%
Banks	12.2%
Supermarkets	9.4%

Note: Views were collected from households in public housing who had made purchases within the past month of the survey.

Multiple answers were allowed.

Utilisation of Car Parking Spaces (*covering households of PRH, TPS and HOS*)

22. 12% of the households had motor vehicle users. The respective percentages in respect of PRH, TPS and HOS were 9%, 16% and 20%. In terms of the vehicle type, they were mostly taxis, vans and lorries for PRH and TPS households, as compared with private cars as the most common vehicle type for HOS households. (Table 20)

Table 20: 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	9.1%	16.2%	19.6%	12.4%
Type of vehicles				
Business cars (e.g. taxi, van and lorry)	65.3%	63.3%	41.7%	56.0%
Private cars	27.7%	34.0%	56.0%	39.4%
Motorcycles	7.0%	2.7%	2.2%	4.6%

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

23. Overall speaking, 34% of these motor vehicle users parked inside the estates / courts. The relevant statistics are set out below. (Table 21)

Table 21: Parking of motor vehicle users in public housing

	PRH	TPS	HOS	Overall
Whether motor vehicle users parked in the estates/courts				
Yes	28.5%	28.8%	43.6%	34.3%
No	71.5%	71.2%	56.4%	65.7%
<i>Reasons for not parking in estates / courts[#]</i>				
<i>Not responsible for parking their cars</i>	35.5%	39.4%	30.4%	34.4%
<i>Cheaper parking fee elsewhere</i>	16.9%	12.9%	27.5%	19.8%
<i>Work purpose</i>	20.6%	14.9%	13.1%	17.2%
<i>24-hour service of the cars (e.g. taxi)</i>	18.5%	20.9%	13.2%	17.2%

[#] Multiple answers were allowed.

Future Housing Plans

Intention of PRH households to purchase HOS / private flats

24. Some 64% of PRH households were aware of the Secondary Market Scheme for them to buy second-hand HOS flats. Around 11% of PRH households were interested to buy second-hand HOS flats. 3% of PRH households intended to buy surplus HOS flats. (Table 22)

Table 22: PRH households' intention of purchasing HOS / private flats

	2009	2010	2011
Whether PRH households were interested to buy second-hand HOS flats			
Yes	12.2%	11.9%	10.5%
No	84.2%	84.2%	83.9%
Not decided yet	3.5%	3.9%	5.6%
Whether PRH households intended to buy surplus HOS flats			
Yes	3.1%	4.3%	3.1%
No	96.2%	95.2%	95.6%
Not decided yet	0.7%	0.5%	1.3%
Whether PRH households intended to buy flats in private sector			
Yes	1.1%	0.5%	0.7%
No	98.2%	99.0%	98.5%
Not decided yet	0.7%	0.5%	0.8%

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

Intention of PRH households to purchase unsold TPS flats

25. Among those tenants currently living in TPS estates, about 16% indicated interest in buying their own flats. They were willing to offer a median flat price of about \$300,000 for a 500-square-foot TPS flat in Urban. (Table 23)

Table 23: Intention of tenants who were living in TPS estates to purchase their own flats

	2009	2010	2011
Whether tenants living in TPS estates indicated interest in purchasing their own flats			
Yes	9.8%	11.5%	15.9%
No	83.1%	85.2%	76.0%
Not decided yet	7.2%	3.3%	8.1%

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

26. There were 687 000 households in PRH with an average household size of 2.9 as at Q1 2011. (paragraphs 1 to 2)

27. There were 113 500 elderly households (i.e. with all members aged 60 or above) in PRH. (paragraph 3)

28. 22% of all PRH households had CSSA recipients. (paragraph 4)

29. The proportion of PRH households satisfied with the performance of estate officers stood at 69%; security services at 81%; cleanliness and hygienic conditions of common areas at 74%; and maintenance-related services at 69%. (paragraph 5)

30. Regarding the maintenance service for households' premises, the percentages of PRH households who were satisfied with the aspects surveyed are: 'handling maintenance requests by estate officers' (72%), 'efficiency of workers in completing maintenance works' (75%), 'working attitude of workers' (76%), 'quality of the works' (62%), 'improvement of environment after the maintenance works' (66%) and 'overall maintenance service' (67%). (paragraph 6)

31. As regards the maintenance works conducted in the estate common areas, the satisfaction levels of PRH households towards 'handling maintenance enquiries by estate officers', 'efficiency of workers in completing maintenance works', 'maintenance of public facilities', 'maintenance of estate outdoor facilities', 'improvement of environment in common areas after the maintenance works' and 'overall maintenance service' ranged from 63% to 72%. (paragraph 7)

32. Almost all of the PRH households (97%) were aware of the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement. Of these households, 67% considered the penalty reasonable; 22% lenient; and 7% stringent. 75% considered that it could improve the cleanliness and hygienic conditions of the estates. 88% of PRH households supported the Department in issuing fixed-penalty notices to offenders within the estate areas; whereas 58% considered that the Marking Scheme was effective to prohibit tenants from keeping dogs. (paragraphs 8 to 9)

33. 73% of PRH households were aware of the need to report abuses of public housing resources. Most of them got this message through the mass media (64%) and leaflet / poster / banner (45%). (paragraph 10)

34. Regarding the roles of EMAC, PRH households were most concerned about its contribution to 'estate maintenance works' (65%), 'security' (60%)

and 'cleansing' (57%). A majority (76%) said that tenants' participation in EMAC could improve estate management services. Of those PRH households who had received 'EMAC Newsletter', 83% considered that the newsletters provided useful information about estate management matters. (paragraphs 11 to 12)

35. Around half of PRH households had used the recycling bins in their estates (48%) and disposed of their used clothes for recycling (50%). Majority of households were using compact fluorescent light-bulbs (81%) and appliances with energy efficiency labels at home (64%). For the environmental protection promotion conducted in the estates, 24% of PRH households were aware of 'Green Delight in Estates' and 17% had participated in the activities. (paragraphs 13 to 14)

36. For the elderly families in PRH who had children living in the private housing, 27% were interested in applying for the Harmonious Families Addition Scheme. (paragraph 15)

37. Among those elderly families who had children living in other PRH flats, 5% and 17% were interested to apply for the Harmonious Families Amalgamation Scheme and the Harmonious Families Transfer Scheme respectively. Of the younger families who had elderly parents living in other PRH flats, 11% and 18% were interested to apply for the two schemes respectively. (paragraphs 16 to 17)

38. One-tenth of PRH households owned bicycles. They used their bicycles for leisure (81%) and commuting purposes (24%). On parking, 76% kept their bicycles inside their premises and 22% in the bicycle parking lots in their estates. (paragraphs 18 to 19)

39. Among the residents in public housing (PRH, TPS and HOS) with HA's retail facilities, 86% had made purchases in these shopping centres / market stalls recently. The most popular types of shops were supermarkets (71%) and market stalls (50%), followed by restaurants (40%). They would like to have more restaurants (45%) and market stalls (44%) in these premises. (paragraphs 20 to 21)

40. 12% of households in public housing had motor vehicle users. The respective percentages in respect of PRH, TPS and HOS were 9%, 16% and 20%. Overall speaking, 34% of these motor vehicle users parked inside the estates / courts. (paragraphs 22 to 23)

41. About 64% of PRH households were aware of Secondary Market Scheme (SMS). Some 11% of PRH households indicated interest in buying second-hand HOS flats, while 3% and less than 1% intended to buy surplus HOS and private flats respectively. (paragraph 24)