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

Public Housing Recurrent Survey 2015

PURPOSE

This paper presents the major findings of the Public Housing Recurrent Survey (PHRS) 2015.

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) [1] and subsidised sale flats [2]) as well as their views on a host of housing issues. The sample size of PHRS 2015 was about 5 000 households, comprising 3 000 households in PRH flats and 2 000 households in subsidised sale flats [3]. The overall response rate was about 90%.

FINDINGS OF PHRS 2015

------- 3. The major findings of PHRS 2015 are set out at the **Appendix**. The statistics from PHRS conducted in previous years are also presented for comparison purpose wherever appropriate. Unless otherwise specified, the statistics presented are at the position of the first quarter of the respective reference year.

---

1 PRH flats exclude Interim Housing units.

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.

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

INFORMATION

4. This paper is issued for Members' information.

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 : 26 October 2015

Appendix

FINDINGS OF PUBLIC HOUSING RECURRENT SURVEY 2015

(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 [1]

Number of households

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

Table 1: Number of PRH households

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
No. of households	687 000	701 600	710 200	726 500	730 600

Household size

2. The average household size was 2.8 persons in 2015. **(Table 2)**

Table 2: Average household size of PRH households

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Average household size	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8

Elderly households [2]

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

Table 3: Number of elderly households in PRH

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
No. of elderly households	113 500	119 000	123 900	130 300	134 100

---

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.

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

Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA)

4. 18% of the PRH households had members receiving CSSA [3]. **(Table 4)**

Table 4: Proportion of CSSA households in PRH

	2011	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
As a proportion of PRH households	22%	21%	20%	19%	18%

(b) TPS

5. The average household size of TPS flats was 3.4 persons in 2015. **(Table 5)**

Table 5: Average household size of TPS households

	2011	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Average household size	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4

(c) HOS

6. The average household size of HOS flats was 3.2 persons in 2015. **(Table 6)**

Table 6: Average household size of HOS households

	2011	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Average household size	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2

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 the aspects of services provided, PRH households were most satisfied with the quality of security services (84%). **(Table 7)**

---

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

Table 7: Views on general estate management services

	2013	2014	2015
Sense of responsibility of estate officers			
Very satisfied / satisfied	68%	72%	73%
Fair	28%	24%	23%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	4%	4%	4%
Quality of security services			
Very satisfied / satisfied	82%	84%	84%
Fair	17%	15%	14%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	2%	1%	2%
Cleanliness and hygienic condition of common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	73%	75%	74%
Fair	23%	21%	22%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	4%	3%	4%
Maintenance-related services in their premises and the estate common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	66%	67%	69%
Fair	25%	23%	22%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	9%	10%	9%

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

Maintenance service for households' premises

8. About 45% 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. 74% 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 (83%). **(Table 8)**

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

	2013	2014	2015
Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance requests			
Very satisfied / satisfied	78%	80%	80%
Fair	18%	14%	15%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	4%	6%	5%
Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	76%	77%	79%
Fair	16%	15%	13%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	8%	8%	8%

	2013	2014	2015
Work attitude of workers			
Very satisfied / satisfied	81%	82%	83%
Fair	16%	14%	14%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3%	4%	3%
Quality of works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	64%	65%	68%
Fair	25%	23%	22%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	12%	12%	10%
Improvement of environment after the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	70%	71%	75%
Fair	20%	20%	18%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	10%	9%	7%
Overall maintenance service inside premises			
Very satisfied / satisfied	71%	73%	74%
Fair	23%	22%	19%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	6%	6%	6%

Notes: 1. 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.
2. Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Maintenance service for estate common areas

9. About 76% 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

	2013	2014	2015
Performance of estate staff in handling maintenance enquiries			
Very satisfied / satisfied	71%	75%	77%
Fair	26%	23%	19%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3%	2%	4%
Efficiency of workers in completing the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	63%	65%	65%
Fair	26%	24%	24%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	12%	11%	11%

	2013	2014	2015
Maintenance of public facilities (e.g. lift and security system)			
Very satisfied / satisfied	72%	72%	75%
Fair	20%	20%	18%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	7%	8%	6%
Maintenance of estates' outdoor facilities (e.g. playground)			
Very satisfied / satisfied	67%	70%	71%
Fair	27%	25%	23%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	6%	5%	6%
Improvement of environment in common areas after the maintenance works			
Very satisfied / satisfied	74%	76%	77%
Fair	22%	20%	21%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	4%	3%	3%
Overall maintenance service of estate common areas			
Very satisfied / satisfied	72%	74%	76%
Fair	25%	23%	20%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	3%	3%	3%

Notes: 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.
2. 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' (45%) as the main reason affecting the effectiveness. On the level of penalty, most of the PRH households considered it reasonable (70%). **(Table 10)**

11. About 57% of PRH households considered the Marking Scheme effective in preventing tenants from throwing objects from height and about 48% considered the Marking Scheme effective in prohibiting unauthorized dog-keeping inside premises. Besides, about 62% 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

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the Marking Scheme			
Yes	96%	94%	93%
No	4%	6%	7%
Whether the Marking Scheme could improve cleanliness and hygienic condition*			
Yes	71%	71%	76%
No	26%	26%	21%
Main reasons for being unable to improve			
Poor self-discipline of tenants	*28%*	*33%*	*45%*
Difficult to catch the culprit	*32%*	*27%*	*20%*
Not enough officers to enforce the scheme	*26%*	*23%*	*20%*
Don’t know / No comment	2%	4%	3%
Whether the level of penalty was reasonable*			
Stringent	6%	6%	5%
Reasonable	67%	65%	70%
Lenient	24%	24%	18%
Don’t know / No comment	3%	5%	7%
Whether the Marking Scheme was effective in preventing tenants from throwing objects from height*			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	57%
No	N.A.	N.A.	39%
Don’t know / No comment	N.A.	N.A.	4%
Whether the Marking Scheme was effective in prohibiting unauthorized dog-keeping in premises*			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	48%
No	N.A.	N.A.	43%
Don’t know / No comment	N.A.	N.A.	9%
Whether allotting 5 points for illegal gambling in the estate common areas was reasonable*			
Stringent	N.A.	6%	6%
Reasonable	N.A.	66%	62%
Lenient	N.A.	23%	24%
Don’t know / No comment	N.A.	6%	8%

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 2013 and/or 2014 surveys.

Reporting abuses of public housing resources

12. About 77% 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 (64%). **(Table 11)**

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

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the promotion for reporting abuses of public housing resources			
Yes	72%	79%	77%
<u>*Major channels*</u>[#]			
Mass media (TV, newspaper, radio)	*62%*	*59%*	*64%*
Leaflet / Poster / Banner	*38%*	*40%*	*36%*
Friends / Neighbours	*14%*	*13%*	*9%*
No	28%	21%	23%

Multiple answers were allowed.

13. Most of the PRH households would call the Housing Authority (HA) hotline (51%) or inform the estate office (44%) 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

	2013	2014	2015
Preferred ways to report abuses of public housing resources[#]			
Calling the HA hotline	50%	53%	51%
Informing the estate office	46%	45%	44%
Sending in the Tenancy Abuse Report Aerogramme / Submitting the Online Form	8%	8%	8%
Sending in complaint letter	7%	6%	7%

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 48% of the PRH households considered that EMAC's participation in estate management matters could improve the living condition in estates. Besides, about 56% 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 83% of the PRH households supported the organisation of partnering functions in estates by EMAC with Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Some 68% considered that these functions could promote neighbourliness and effectively enhance households' sense of belonging to the community. **(Table 13)**

Table 13: Opinion on EMAC

	2013	2014	2015
Whether EMAC's participation in estate management matters could improve the living condition in estates			
Yes	60%	53%	48%
No	17%	12%	14%
Don't know / No comment	22%	35%	39%
Whether EMAC could enhance households' awareness of and participation in estate management matters, as well as households' communication with the HD			
Yes	70%	68%	56%
No	17%	13%	18%
Don't know / No comment	14%	19%	26%
Whether organisation of partnering functions in estates by EMAC with NGOs were supported			
Yes	88%	85%	83%
No	6%	4%	6%
Don't know / No comment	7%	10%	11%
Whether organisation of partnering functions with NGOs by EMAC could promote neighbourliness and enhance households' sense of belonging to the community			
Yes	78%	77%	68%
No	14%	11%	17%
Don't know / No comment	8%	12%	16%

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

EMAC Newsletters

16. About 64% of the PRH households considered that the EMAC Newsletters provided useful information on estate management matters. **(Table 14)**

Table 14: Opinion on EMAC Newsletters

	2013	2014	2015
Whether the EMAC Newsletters provided useful information on estate management matters			
Yes	69%	68%	64%
No	18%	16%	17%
Don't know / No comment	13%	16%	19%

(c) Environmental Awareness of PRH Households

Utilisation of environmental facilities

17. About 57% 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 (81%). **(Table 15)**

Table 15: Recycling habit

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

Multiple answers were allowed.

18. Over half (57%) of the PRH households had recycled their used clothes in the past six-month period. As for energy conservation measures, about 86% were using compact fluorescent light-bulbs / lamp and about 78% were using appliances / equipment with energy efficiency labels at home. **(Table 16)**

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

	2013	2014	2015
Whether used clothes were recycled in the past six-month period			
Yes	53%	56%	57%
No	46%	43%	42%
Don't remember	1%	1%	1%
Whether compact fluorescent light bulbs / lamp were used			
Yes	90%	87%	86%
No	8%	11%	12%
Don't remember	2%	2%	2%
Whether appliances / equipment with energy efficiency labels were used			
Yes	73%	78%	78%
No	22%	17%	16%
Don't remember	5%	5%	6%

Awareness of the environmental programme

19. About 36% of the PRH households had heard about the long-term environmental programme 'Green Delight in Estates' [4]. **(Table 17)**

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

	2013	2014	2015
Yes	33%	40%	36%
No	67%	60%	64%

Awareness of the HA's sustainability performance

20. On HA's sustainability performance, PRH households mainly cared about 'PRH rent adjustment and rent assistance' (51%). **(Table 18)**

Table 18: The main issues PRH households cared about on HA's sustainability performance

	2014	2015
The main issues PRH households cared about on HA's sustainability performance#		
PRH rent adjustment and rent assistance	46%	51%
Cleanliness and hygienic condition in estates	42%	45%
Estate maintenance	45%	42%
Facilities in estates	22%	23%
Allocation and transfer schemes of PRH flats	17%	20%

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 and had children living in private housing, 21% 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)**

4 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 19: Opinion of households with elderly tenant(s) who had offspring living in private housing on the Harmonious Families Addition Scheme

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	46%	44%	49%
No	54%	56%	51%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	29%	26%	21%
No	60%	61%	66%
Reasons#			
Don't want to live together with offspring	*55%*	*48%*	*54%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*21%*	*23%*	*25%*
Not qualified	*17%*	*22%*	*15%*
Don't know / No comment	11%	13%	13%

Multiple answers were allowed.

22. For elderly households (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 and about 15% 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

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	47%	46%	48%
No	53%	54%	52%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	7%	11%	6%
No	81%	79%	76%
Reasons#			
Don't want to live together with offspring	*69%*	*61%*	*60%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*16%*	*23%*	*28%*
Don't want to move	*8%*	*15%*	*6%*
Living nearby currently	*20%*	*10%*	*6%*
Don't know / No comment	12%	10%	18%

Multiple answers were allowed.

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

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	51%	45%	47%
No	49%	55%	53%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	11%	12%	15%
No	83%	75%	67%
Reasons#			
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*21%*	*33%*	*39%*
Living nearby currently	*43%*	*24%*	*22%*
Don't want to move	*24%*	*21%*	*19%*
Don't want to live too close to offspring	*19%*	*27%*	*15%*
Don't know / No comment	6%	13%	18%

Multiple answers were allowed.

Views from younger families

23. About 9% 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 19% 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

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	74%	70%	68%
No	26%	30%	32%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	14%	12%	9%
No	82%	79%	82%
Reasons#			
Don't want to live with elderly parents	*46%*	*44%*	*51%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*24%*	*36%*	*28%*
Living nearby currently	*20%*	*12%*	*9%*
Don't want to move	*9%*	*13%*	*7%*
Don't know / No comment	4%	10%	9%

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

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of the scheme			
Yes	68%	64%	67%
No	32%	36%	33%
Whether the households would consider making an application under the scheme			
Yes	24%	20%	19%
No	68%	71%	63%
Reasons#			
Living nearby currently	*33%*	*30%*	*29%*
Satisfied with the current living conditions	*25%*	*36%*	*26%*
Don't want to live too close to elderly parents	*21%*	*17%*	*18%*
Don't want to move	*15%*	*21%*	*12%*
Don’t know / No comment	9%	10%	18%

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

(e) Rent Payment

Rent payment methods

24. The majority (87%) of the PRH households knew about various rent payment methods (e.g. service provided at convenience stores and supermarkets) other than paying at estate shroff offices. The most common rent payment methods used by the PRH households were paying at convenience stores (38%) and estate shroff offices (26%). **(Table 24)**

25. For households who were paying rent at estate shroff offices, the main reason was ‘convenient location’ (55%). About 83% of them indicated that they would pay rent at convenience stores or supermarkets if there were no rent payment service at estate shroff offices. **(Table 24)**

Table 24: Opinion on rent payment methods

	2013	2014	2015
Aware of various rent payment methods other than paying at estate shroff offices			
Yes	91%	86%	87%
No	9%	14%	13%
The most common rent payment methods#			
Convenience stores	34%	38%	38%
Estate shroff offices	28%	26%	26%
Autopay	20%	19%	19%
Direct rent payment for CSSA households	18%	19%	19%
Main reasons for paying rent at estate shroff offices* #			
Convenient location	53%	64%	55%
Getting used to paying rent at estate shroff offices	34%	29%	33%
Detailed invoiced issued	28%	26%	22%
Alternative methods to adopt if there were no estate shroff offices* #			
Convenience stores / Supermarkets^	81%	86%	83%
Autopay	25%	20%	30%
PPS / ATM / Internet / Phone banking	26%	19%	23%

Multiple answers were allowed.
* Refer to views expressed by PRH households who were paying rent at estate shroff offices.
^ The percentages for 2013 and 2014 also covered the alternative method of paying rent at MTR Customer Service Centres, while this service is not available now.

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 in 7-Eleven. Among the four channels, PRH households were most aware of the services provided in 7-Eleven (43%). To check the rent status, most households would go to 7-Eleven (42%). **(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%	36%	28%	43%
No	79%	64%	72%	57%
Intention of using the rent enquiry services to check the rent status if necessary				
Yes	29%	31%	20%	42%
No	65%	62%	75%	53%
<u>Main reasons for not using the enquiry services</u>#				
Rent payment particulars are already provided on the payment receipts or passbook	*53%*	*54%*	*41%*	*54%*
Lack of computing knowledge / No computer	*N.A.*	*N.A.*	*34%*	*N.A.*
More convenient to enquire through the estate offices	*17%*	*13%*	*11%*	*24%*
Complicated procedures	*11%*	*16%*	*12%*	*N.A.*
Don’t know / No comment	6%	7%	5%	4%

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Multiple answers were allowed.
N.A.: The reason 'Lack of computing knowledge / No computer’ was not applicable to Rent Enquiry Hotline, Kiosk and 7-Eleven; ‘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 (22%) was higher than those in Extended Urban (17%) and Urban (7%) areas. **(Table 26)**

Table 26: PRH households’ bicycle ownership

	Urban	**Extended Urban**	**New Territories**	**Overall**
Yes	7%	17%	22%	13%
No	93%	83%	78%	87%

28. PRH households used their bicycles mainly for leisure (80%). On parking, 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	80%
Commuting purposes	20%
Parking of bicycles#	
Inside their flats	79%
Bicycle parking lots in estates	19%

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 23% 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

	2013	2014	2015
Whether tenants living in TPS estates would consider buying their own TPS flats			
Yes	21%	23%	23%
No	70%	65%	59%
Not decided yet	9%	12%	18%

(b) Intention of PRH households to purchase HOS flats

30. 67% of the PRH households were aware of the HOS Secondary Market Scheme (SMS). About 11% of the PRH households indicated that they would consider buying second-hand HOS flats either on the HOS Secondary Market or on the open market. Also, about 11% of the PRH households would consider buying new HOS flats. **(Table 29)**

Table 29: PRH households' intention of purchasing HOS flats

	2013	2014	2015
Whether PRH households were aware of the SMS (i.e. purchase of second-hand HOS flats with premium not yet paid)			
Yes	72%	64%	67%
No	28%	36%	33%
Whether PRH households would consider buying second-hand HOS flats (on the HOS Secondary Market or on the open market)			
Yes	14%	14%	11%
No	81%	82%	80%
Not decided yet	5%	4%	9%
Whether PRH households would consider buying new HOS flats			
Yes	8%	8%	11%
No	85%	83%	80%
Not decided yet	7%	9%	9%

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

31. 36% 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 (31%) and sales brochure of HOS flats (29%). 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 2% of the HOS flat owners indicated that they would consider selling their flats within a year either on the Secondary Market or on the open market. **(Table 30)**

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

	2013	2014	2015
Whether HOS flat owners were aware of the procedures for selling HOS flats			
Yes	37%	36%	36%
Major channels to obtain the information#			
Mass media	*33%*	*32%*	*31%*
Sales brochure of HOS flats	*21%*	*26%*	*29%*
Friends / relatives	*16%*	*22%*	*20%*
HA website	*13%*	*11%*	*17%*
No	63%	64%	64%
Whether HOS flat owners were aware that it was not necessary to pay premium for sale of their flats on the HOS Secondary Market			
Yes	75%	66%	70%
No	25%	34%	30%

	2013	2014	2015
Whether HOS flat owners would consider selling their flats within a year			
Yes	2%	1%	2%
No	96%	96%	97%
Not decided yet	2%	3%	2%

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

32. Generally speaking, about 78% 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' (85%) and 'fire safety installation' (82%). **(Table 31)**

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

	Very satisfied / satisfied	Fair	Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied
Overall Satisfaction	**78%**	**20%**	**2%**
Lighting	*85%*	*13%*	*2%*
Fire safety installation	*82%*	*16%*	*2%*
Air conditioning	*80%*	*16%*	*4%*
Opening hours	*78%*	*20%*	*2%*
Security	*78%*	*20%*	*2%*
Map and directory	*78%*	*19%*	*3%*
Corridor (e.g. layout, accessibility)	*77%*	*19%*	*4%*
Maintenance	*76%*	*22%*	*2%*
Hygienic condition	*75%*	*19%*	*5%*
Handling enquiries & complaints	*74%*	*24%*	*2%*
Promotional activities & decoration for holidays	*74%*	*23%*	*3%*
Design and decoration of shops	*67%*	*29%*	*3%*

Notes: 1. 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.
2. Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Shops

33. The most frequently visited shops were 'supermarkets' (68%), 'restaurants' (40%) and 'market stalls' (39%). The most common reason for purchasing at these shops was 'convenient location' (83%). Most of the shoppers wanted to have more restaurants (21%), market stalls (18%) and banks (17%). **(Table 32)**

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

	Proportion
Types of shops that were most frequently visited#	
Supermarkets	68%
Restaurants	40%
Market stalls	39%
Main reasons for shopping in HA's shopping centres / market stalls#	
Convenient location	83%
Competitive pricing	8%
No alternatives nearby	8%
Types of shops that the shoppers wanted to have more#	
Restaurants	21%
Market stalls	18%
Banks	17%

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

34. 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 (63%) and TPS (51%) households, while private cars were the most common vehicle type for HOS households (63%). **(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	11%	17%	21%	14%
Type of vehicles				
Business cars (e.g. taxi, van and lorry)	63%	51%	35%	51%
Private cars	32%	42%	63%	44%
Motorcycles	6%	7%	2%	5%

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

35. Overall speaking, about 40% of these 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	32%	40%	53%	40%
No	68%	60%	47%	60%
Main reasons #				
Not responsible for parking their cars	*31%*	*31%*	*38%*	*33%*
Parking elsewhere due to job-related requirements	*29%*	*27%*	*23%*	*27%*
Cheaper parking fee elsewhere	*13%*	*19%*	*15%*	*14%*
Vehicles were in 24-hour operation (e.g. taxi)	*13%*	*7%*	*9%*	*11%*
Parking space in estates / courts was full	*10%*	*13%*	*12%*	*11%*

Multiple answers were allowed.

(c) Handling of Enquiries / Complaints

36. Some 20% 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 (88%). About 54% 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 on the efficiency of handling enquiries / complaints (35%) and the service quality of the staff (23%) were needed. **(Table 35)**

Table 35: Opinion on handling enquiries / complaints

	2013	2014	2015
Main subjects of households' enquiries / complaints#			
Estate / court management matters	87%	88%	88%
Application for public housing	7%	7%	6%
Rent related / tenancy matters (applicable to PRH only)	4%	4%	4%
Whether the households were satisfied with the HA enquiry / complaint service			
Very satisfied / satisfied	55%	53%	54%
Fair	22%	22%	21%
Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied	23%	24%	25%
Major areas of improvement#			
No comment	35%	37%	43%
Efficiency	30%	35%	35%
Service quality of staff	25%	18%	23%

Notes: 1. Views were collected from households in public housing who had made enquiries or complaints within the past one-year period before the survey.
2. Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Multiple answers were allowed.