



中大香港亞太研究所民調： 三成市民認為施政報告房屋政策 對住屋問題有頗大或很大幫助 四成三料幫助很少

特首林鄭月娥日前發表施政報告，公眾最關心的房屋政策為其中一大重點。香港中文大學香港亞太研究所最近就此進行的一項電話調查發現，三成市民認為施政報告中提出的房屋政策對解決香港市民的住屋問題有頗大或很大幫助，但也有四成三人認為這些政策的幫助很少。在房屋政策的各項具體建議中，超過一半的市民認為增加過渡性房屋供應是有效紓緩輪候公屋家庭住屋困難的方法。

是次調查在二零一七年十月十九至二十五日晚上進行，共成功訪問了 731 位 18 歲或以上的市民。調查結果發現，對於施政報告中提出的房屋政策，三成（30.0%）受訪者認為對解決市民的住屋問題有頗大或很大的幫助，四成三（42.6%）認為幫助的效果很少，另有 6.0% 則認為完全沒有幫助（見附表一）。按受訪者年齡進行的組別比較分析顯示，51 歲或以上組別的受訪者中，認為幫助效果頗大或很大的比例（38.1%），在統計上顯著高於其它組別（見附表二）。

施政報告提出，在居屋之上，提供中產家庭可以負擔的「港人首置上車盤」。約三成（31.3%）受訪者認為這一政策對解決超過申請居屋資格的中產家庭的置業問題有頗大或很大的幫助，四成半（45.7%）認為有很少的幫助，另有約一成（10.5%）受訪者則認為完全沒有幫助（見附表三）。對於施政報告將「港人首置上車盤」合資格家庭收入上限定為 68,000 元，近三成（28.3%）受訪者認為這一上限過高，四成半（44.7%）表

示合適，另有不到一成（7.8%）則認為這一上限過低（見附表四）。

施政報告建議大量增加「綠表置居計劃」（「綠置居」）單位，並將「綠置居」恆常化。對於這一建議，超過四成（42.0%）受訪者認為其對解決公屋住戶的置業問題有頗大或很大的幫助，另有近四成（37.2%）認為有很多的幫助，近一成（8.8%）受訪者則認為完全沒有幫助（見附表五）。

施政報告也建議房委會將「白表免補地價購買二手居屋計劃」（「白居二」）恆常化，讓合資格白表人士可購置未補價居屋單位。約三成半（36.6%）受訪者認為這一建議對解決合資格購買居屋人士的置業問題有頗大或很大的幫助，約四成（42.7%）認為有很多的幫助，5.5%受訪者則認為完全沒有幫助（見附表六）。

施政報告還提出，將協助和促成由民間主導和推行的短期措施，如用政府閒置建築物提供租住單位，研究讓整幢工廈免補地價改裝為過渡性房屋，以及在閒置土地興建預製組合屋等，增加過渡性住屋供應。對於這一政策，超過一半（51.6%）受訪者認為這對紓緩輪候公屋家庭的住屋困難有頗大或很大的幫助，約三成（31.0%）認為有很多的幫助，6.2%受訪者則認為完全沒有幫助（見附表七）。

是次調查的成功回應率為 37.6%。以 731 個成功樣本數推算，百分比變項的抽樣誤差約在正或負 3.62 個百分點以內（可信度設於 95%）。

中大香港亞太研究所電話調查研究室
二零一七年十一月六日

傳媒查詢：中大香港亞太研究所助理所長鄭宏泰博士（電話：3943 1341）。

附表一：施政報告房屋政策對解決香港市民住屋問題的幫助（百分比）

	百分比
完全沒有	6.0
很少	42.6
頗大	25.8
很大	4.2
不知道／很難說	21.4
(樣本數)	(730)

題目：「整體嚟講，你認為施政報告提出嘅房屋政策對解決香港市民嘅住屋問題有幾大幫助？係完全冇、好少、幾大、定係好大幫助呢？」

附表二：施政報告房屋政策對解決香港市民住屋問題的幫助（年齡組別比較分析）（百分比）*

	30 歲或以下	31 歲-50 歲	51 歲或以上
完全沒有	5.8	5.7	5.8
很少	61.2	43.6	36.4
頗大	13.2	24.1	32.3
很大	1.6	3.9	5.8
不知道／很難說	18.2	22.7	19.7
(樣本數)	(121)	(282)	(310)

* 經卡方檢定顯示，不同年齡組別對施政報告房屋政策對解決香港市民住屋問題幫助程度看法的百分比分布呈統計上的顯著差異 [$p < 0.05$]。

附表三：「港人首置上車盤」對解決中產家庭置業問題的幫助（百分比）

	百分比
完全沒有	10.5
很少	45.7
頗大	24.5
很大	6.8
不知道／很難說	12.4
(樣本數)	(731)

題目：「施政報告提出，喺居屋之上，提供中產家庭可以負擔嘅「港人首置上車盤」。你認為呢個政策，對解決超過申請居屋資格嘅中產家庭嘅置業問題有幾大幫助？係完全冇、好少、幾大、定係好大幫助呢？」

附表四：「港人首置上車盤」合資格家庭收入上限（百分比）

	百分比
過高	28.3
合適	44.7
過低	7.8
不知道／很難說	19.2
(樣本數)	(731)

題目：「施政報告提出，「港人首置上車盤」合資格家庭收入上限定為 68,000 元，你認為呢個上限係過高、合適、定係過低呢？」

附表五：恆常化「綠置居」對解決公屋住戶置業問題的幫助（百分比）

	百分比
完全沒有	8.8
很少	37.2
頗大	35.8
很大	6.2
不知道／很難說	12.0
(樣本數)	(731)

題目：「施政報告提出，建議大量增加「綠表置居計劃」（即所謂「綠置居」）單位，並將佢恆常化。你認為呢個政策對解決公屋住戶嘅置業問題有幾大幫助？係完全冇、好少、幾大、定係好大幫助呢？」

附表六：恆常化「白居二」對解決合資格購買居屋人士置業問題的幫助（百分比）

	百分比
完全沒有	5.5
很少	42.7
頗大	30.6
很大	6.0
不知道／很難說	15.2
(樣本數)	(730)

題目：「施政報告提出，建議房委會將「白表免補地價購買二手居屋計劃」（即所謂「白居二」）恆常化。你認為呢個政策對解決合資格購買居屋人士嘅置業問題有幾大幫助？係完全冇、好少、幾大、定係好大幫助呢？」

附表七：增加過渡性房屋供應對紓緩輪候公屋家庭住屋困難的幫助（百分比）

	百分比
完全沒有	6.2
很少	31.0
頗大	41.6
很大	10.0
不知道／很難說	11.2
(樣本數)	(731)

題目：「施政報告提出，將通過各種短期措施，如用政府閒置建築物提供租住單位，俾工廈免補地價改裝為過渡性房屋，以及喺閒置土地興建預製組合屋等，增加過渡性住屋供應。你認為呢個政策對紓緩輪候公屋家庭嘅住屋困難有幾大幫助？係完全冇、好少、幾大、定係好大幫助呢？」

**Survey Findings on Views about the Housing Policies in the CE Policy Address
Released by Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies at CUHK**

A telephone survey was conducted from 19 to 25 October 2017 by Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong to gauge public views about the housing policies proposed in the recent Chief Executive's policy address. 731 respondents aged 18 or above were successfully interviewed, with a response rate of 37.6%. The sampling error is + or -3.62% at a confidence level of 95%.

Major findings are summarized as follows:

For the housing policies proposed in the recent CE policy address, the survey asked the respondents' opinion on the helpfulness of these policies to resolve the housing problem in Hong Kong. 30.0% of the respondents believed that those policies were quite helpful or very helpful while 42.6% said they were a little bit helpful. Only 6.0% believed those policies were not helpful at all. Compared with other age groups, there was a significantly higher percentage (38.1%) of people believed the policies were quite or very helpful among those aged 51 or above.

The policy address proposed to introduce a "Starter Homes" Scheme for Hong Kong middle-class families. Around one third (31.3%) of the respondents said this policy was quite helpful or very helpful to solve the housing problem for those families who are not eligible for Home Ownership Scheme (HOS). 45.7% believed it was a little bit helpful while 10.5% believed it was not helpful at all. The policy address suggested the upper income limit for this new scheme to be set at not exceeding \$68,000 for households with two or more members. 28.3% of the respondent said this upper limit was too high, 44.7% said it was suitable and 7.8% said it was too low.

The policy address proposed to substantially increase the supply of units under the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (GSH) and requested the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) to regularise GSH. 42.0% of the respondents said this policy was quite helpful or very helpful for public rental housing tenants to become home-owners. 37.2% believed it was a little bit helpful while 8.8% believed it was not helpful at all.

The policy address also proposed HKHA to regularise the Interim Scheme of Extending the HOS Secondary Market to White Form Buyers to allow eligible White Form applicants to

purchase HOS flats with premium unpaid. 36.6% of the respondents said this policy was quite helpful or very helpful to allow tenants of private premises more opportunities to become home-owners. 42.7% said it was a little bit helpful while 5.5% said it was not helpful at all.

The policy report recommended to facilitate the implementation of various short-term community initiatives, such as optimising the use of idle government premises to provide rental housing units, exploring the wholesale conversion of industrial buildings into transitional housing with waiver of land premium and the feasibility of constructing pre-fabricated modular housing on idle sites, to increase the supply of transitional housing. More than half (51.6%) of the respondents believed this policy was quite helpful or very helpful to alleviate the hardship faced by families on the public rental housing waiting list. 31.0% believed it was a little bit helpful while 6.2% believed it was not helpful at all.

Media Contacts: Dr. ZHENG Wan-tai Victor, Assistant Director (Tel: 3943 1341).