



SACOSS

*South Australian Council
of Social Service*

SACOSS

Cost of Living Update

No.52

**Rental Affordability
in Adelaide**

**December Quarter
2022**



Cost of Living Update No. 52: Rental Affordability in Adelaide

December Quarter, 2022

ISSN 1836-5248 (Print)

ISSN 1836-5256 (Online)

First published in February 2023 by the South Australian Council of Social Service

Email: sacoss@sacoss.org.au

Website: www.sacoss.org.au

© South Australian Council of Social Service, 2023

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Housing Tenure	3
Housing Costs	4
Affordability	5
Changes Over Time in Rental Prices.....	6
Rental Reform	7
State Electorates	8
Why State Electorates Matter.....	8
Numbers of Renters and Low-Income Renters	8
Affordability	9
Top Ten Renter Affordability Electorates.....	11
Conclusion	12
Appendix 1. Background Data for Tables 5 and 6.....	13
Appendix 2: Ranking of Renter Electorates.....	15
Sources	16

List of Tables

Table 1: Housing Tenure, Adelaide.....	4
Table 2: Housing Costs, Adelaide December 2022.....	4
Table 3: Rental Affordability for Low Income Earners	6
Table 4: Price Increases for New Rentals in the Last Year.....	6
Table 5: State Electorates with the Highest Proportion of Renters	9
Table 6: Rental Affordability by State Electorate	10
Table 7: Top Ten Renter Electorates	11

Executive Summary

This report focuses on rental affordability in metropolitan Adelaide and is the latest in a series of SACOSS *Cost of Living Updates* tracking changes in living costs for South Australians on low incomes and/or experiencing disadvantage.

Adelaide Data

ABS data from 2020 and 2021 showed that there were approximately 152,000 renter households in the Greater Adelaide area, constituting 28% of the Adelaide housing market. Around three-quarters of renters are private renters, and many are low-income households. More than half of all Adelaide renters were in the bottom two income quintiles, with around a third of those in rental stress (i.e. low income and spending more than 30% of their income on housing).

In the December Quarter 2022, the median rent in the Greater Adelaide area was approximately \$338 per week for all renters and \$417 in the private market. In the cheaper suburbs the median rent for a *new* tenancy in a two-bedroom apartment was \$340 per week and \$400p.w. for a three-bedroom house. The table below shows these rental costs as a proportion of particular incomes. It highlights how unaffordable these rents are to those on very low incomes.

	Total Income*	% of Income 2-bed unit	% of income 3 bed house
Single JobSeeker	\$414.40	82%	
Single Age Pensioner	\$589.50	58%	
Single Minimum Wage	\$812.60	42%	
Single Parent JobSeeker – 2 children	\$717.70	47%	56%
Single Parent Minimum Wage – 2 children	\$1,196.33	28%	33%

* includes where appropriate Centrelink Supplements, Commonwealth Rent Assistance and Family Tax Benefits based on children aged 10 and 14. Sources (Services Australia, 2022; Govt of SA, 2022).

This situation appears to be getting worse. While the CPI for rent prices in Adelaide (including public housing) increased by 4.9% in the last year, the average increase in median rents for new private tenancies across the metropolitan area has gone up by 14.3%. These increases will flow through to the rest of the market and suggest that the rental affordability crisis will remain for some time.

State Electorates

This report also analyses rental affordability in different state electorates within the metropolitan area. This identifies not only the areas where rental affordability issues impact most, but also which MPs might be expected to take a particular interest or be parliamentary champions on issues of rental affordability.

The analysis shows the electorates with above the average (median) proportion of renters, of low-income renters, and renters spending more than 30% of their income on rent, as well as the median rent in each electorate and increases in that rent between the last two censuses. Each of these metrics is considered separately listing electorates in order from highest to lowest for each topic. An overall calculation is then made based on each electorates' rank in each topic list. By a simple sum of these rankings, the report identifies the top ten electorates where rental

affordability issues impact most, and the political representatives of those areas who we would hope to see champion affordability issues for renters. The top ten electorates (in descending order) are listed below.

Electorate	Elected Representative	Party
Adelaide	Lucy Hood	Labor
Elizabeth	Lee Odenwalder	Labor
Cheltenham	Joe Szakacs	Labor
Hartley	Vincent Tarzia	Liberal
Enfield	Andrea Michaels	Labor
Ramsay	Zoe Bettison	Labor
Kaurna	Chris Picton	Labor
Elder	Nadia Clancy	Labor
West Torrens	Tom Koutsantonis	Labor
Dunstan	Steven Marshall	Liberal

Given the current make-up of the parliament and the Ministry, the representatives of these ten electorates include 5 current ministers, the government whip, and a former Premier and former Minister now in Opposition, so there is opportunity for significant voices in parliament on issues of rental affordability (in addition to those individuals and parties in the Legislative Council who are already advocating on behalf of tenants to reduce rental affordability issues).

Introduction

This report is the latest in a series of SACOSS [*Cost of Living Updates*](#) tracking changes in living costs for South Australians on low incomes and/or experiencing disadvantage.

This report focuses on rental affordability for those on low incomes in metropolitan Adelaide.

This report is a follow up to the SACOSS's [*Cost of Living Update No. 49*](#) (December Quarter 2021) which had a focus on rental affordability for those on low incomes in South Australia as a whole, and the [*Update No. 50*](#) (June Quarter 2022) on rental affordability in Regional South Australia.

The focus on renting and housing costs is called for because housing is a fundamental human need. It is also the largest expenditure of most Australian households, accounting for 18.4% of average household expenditure in South Australia (ABS, 2017, Table 13.5). However, this average is brought down by home-owners with low housing costs.

For those on low incomes who do not own their own home, rent or mortgage payments constitute not just the largest single household expenditure, but one which impacts on the quality of life and the ability to pay for all other goods and services. The consequences of not paying for housing costs – which could result in eviction and potentially homelessness – invariably mean that people have no choice but to sacrifice other household needs in order to keep up with paying their housing costs. Housing affordability is therefore one of the most critical social policy issues facing South Australians.

The plight of home-owners with mortgages facing interest rate increases grabs many of the headlines, but as argued in our previous reports, renters on average have lower incomes and proportionately higher housing costs (SACOSS, 2022a). They are also likely to have higher interest rates passed on through rent and are more likely to struggle with housing affordability – hence the focus in our reports on rental affordability.

Housing Tenure

At the 2021 Census there were 536,048 households living in the Greater Adelaide area, which encompasses Adelaide centre and suburbs, hills, and stretching to Gawler in the north and Willunga in the southern vales. This was three-quarters of the entire South Australian housing market, with renters making up some 28% of Adelaide households. That equates to 152,198 households, with over 350,000 people renting in Adelaide. (ABS, 2022a)

The table below shows the census data on housing tenure in the Greater Adelaide area, with a comparison to the ABS data from the Survey of Income and Housing (SIH) which was used in previous SACOSS *Cost of Living Updates*. While there are small differences in the data, this is more likely due to different methodology rather than real differences on the ground or changes in the year between data collection. There are also differences in categories, so that for instance, renting from a Community Housing Provider does not appear as a category in the SIH data, but is included in the “Other Rentals” category.

Table 1: Housing Tenure, Adelaide

	2019-20 SIH Data	2021 Census Data
Owner without mortgage	28%	30.9%
Owner with mortgage	40%	37.1%
Total Owners	68.2%	68%
Renting – State Housing	4.7%	4.2%
Renting – Community Housing Provider		1.5%
Renting – Real Estate Agent	22.8%	15%
Renting – Private Landlord not in same house		6.6%
Renting – Other	2.4%	0.9%
Total Renters	29.6%	28.4%

Source: ABS (2022a) Greater Adelaide Community Profile, Table G37: ABS (2022b), Table 11.3.

Housing Costs

Housing costs vary across different tenancy types. The table below updates the 2019-20 Survey of Income and Housing data using CPI to give current costs. These housing costs include water, rates and other direct costs of housing and so are not comparable to the rental costs discussed later in these reports, but they do provide a basis of comparison across different tenure types.

Table 2: Housing Costs, Adelaide December 2022

	Median Housing Costs \$p.w.	Housing Costs as % of Gross H/Hold Income
Owner without mortgage	\$ 57	4.5%
Owner with mortgage	\$ 601	14.8%
Renting – State Housing	\$ 140	22.6%
Renting – Private Landlord	\$ 417	21.4%

Median Housing Costs is 2019-20 data updated to December 2022 using Adelaide CPI Rent (ABS, 2023a) and mortgage interest payment index from Selected Living Cost Index (ABS, 2023b). Cost as % of Gross Household Income is 2019-20 figure. ABS (2022b), Table 11.1, 11.2.

While owners with mortgages pay the highest amount outright, in 2019-20 this was a smaller part of their total household income than the costs paid by private renters. Whether that is still the same given recent interest rate rises is a matter of conjecture, but as noted in the previous SACOSS report, these figures also under-estimate the incomes of home-owners as they do not account for imputed rent (housing services provided free to home-owners) or capital gains on those housing assets enjoyed by home owners. Further, mortgagees' costs also include the 'compulsory savings' of capital repayments, so the data isn't a direct comparison of current housing costs (SACOSS, 2022a).

This is not to devalue the affordability concerns of home-owners, particularly those on low incomes, but the focus here remains on rental affordability as more than half of all Adelaide renters in 2019-20 were in the bottom two income quintiles, with around a third of those in rental stress (i.e. low income and spending more than 30% of their income on housing (ABS, 2022b).

Further, these figures were significantly below the figures for previous years. This was, in significant part, because the 2019-20 data includes part of the period when the Coronavirus Supplement (an extra \$550 per fortnight) was paid to eligible social security recipients and there were legislated restraints on rent increases and evictions. For a period of time this lifted a large number of households out of poverty and therefore out of housing stress (albeit only temporarily).

As the data below will show, affordability remains a significant challenge for low-income renters.

Affordability

As in previous SACOSS *Cost of Living Updates*, the affordability challenge for renters can be seen in the SA government data from rental bond lodgings compared with income levels provided by different income streams. There are some limitations to the rental bond data as it only captures the price of new rentals, not the amount paid on all existing rentals, and it is limited to private rentals – hence the median rents are different from the data above. However, the rental bond data does reflect the prices faced by people currently looking to rent. Further, where the rent for new tenancies is significantly above existing rents, it signifies future rental rises as existing rents catch up over time (Bradbury, 2023).

Using the rental bond data, SACOSS calculates that the median rental for a 2-bedroom unit in the cheaper Adelaide suburbs in the December Quarter 2022 was \$340 per week. It was \$400 for a 3-bedroom house.¹ As in previous SACOSS reports, these house types are used for analysis rather than the averages of all new rentals. The latter can be impacted by changes in the mix of housing from quarter to quarter (e.g. different proportions of houses/ units, or a greater proportion of bigger or smaller houses in any quarter), and the two-bedroom unit and three-bedroom house-types also serve as a proxy for appropriate housing for a single person² and for a family with children, respectively.

The following table shows the proportion of income required for selected low-income households to rent in those cheaper Adelaide suburbs. Based on the “30% of income” housing stress benchmark, ***these rental prices are unaffordable for people on low incomes looking to rent.*** The only exemplar that falls below the 30% stress threshold is the single parent on a minimum wage looking to rent a two-bedroom flat. With the median rent taking 28% of household income, it is only just below the stress threshold and the accommodation would be crowded. A larger dwelling or house is unaffordable.

¹ These figures are the median rent in the suburb which was the mid-point (mode) among the bottom half of Adelaide suburbs where rental bonds were lodged.

² A one-bedroom unit might also be appropriate but there are far fewer available and the data is unreliable.

Table 3: Rental Affordability for Low Income Earners

	Total Income*	% of Income 2-bed unit	% of income 3 bed house
Single JobSeeker	\$414.40	82%	
Single Age Pensioner	\$589.50	58%	
Single Minimum Wage	\$812.60	42%	
Single Parent JobSeeker – 2 children	\$717.70	47%	56%
Single Parent Minimum Wage – 2 children	\$1,196.33	28%	33%

* includes where appropriate Centrelink Supplements, Commonwealth Rent Assistance and Family Tax Benefits based on children aged 10 and 14. Sources (Services Australia, 2022; Govt of SA, 2023).

Changes Over Time in Rental Prices

The above is a snapshot of the current data, but the changes over recent years further highlight the rental affordability difficulties facing Adelaide renters. Compared to the same table in last December's *Cost of Living Update* (SACOSS, 2022a), the percent of income required to rent in the table above has increased in all categories except one. The only exception is the Single Parent JobSeeker looking for a 3-bedroom house, where the percent of income required is about the same.

The table below builds on this analysis by showing increases in the median weekly rent of new rentals over the past year (Dec Qtr 2021 – Dec Qtr 2022) – again using 2-bedroom units and 3-bedroom houses as the exemplars. While there were differences across metropolitan regions, the average increase in the rent price for new tenancies across the metropolitan region for both housing types was 14.3%.

Table 4: Price Increases for New Rentals in the Last Year

	2 Bedroom Unit		3 Bedroom House	
	Dec 2021	Dec 2022	Dec 2021	Dec 2022
Northern Adelaide	\$300	\$350	\$380	\$440
Western Adelaide	\$320	\$373	\$450	\$520
Eastern Adelaide	\$390	\$450	\$500	\$580
Southern Adelaide	\$330	\$380	\$430	\$495
Total Metropolitan Adelaide	\$350	\$400	\$420	\$480

Source: Government of SA (2022, 2023).

The increases in the table above are well above the general inflation rate (CPI All-Groups) which for Adelaide was 8.6% for the year, but can be contrasted to the CPI rental data which showed an annual increase of only 4.6%. The difference is fairly standard in that the above are new rentals in the private market, while CPI measures all current rentals (not just new tenancies) and includes social housing and other non-market rentals.

As noted above, the higher-than-inflation increases in rents for new tenancies signals ongoing pressure pushing higher rental prices as the new tenancies increases flow through the market. However, it is also important because when rents increase more than CPI it means that the real income going to landlords is increasing, at the expense of renters whose cost of living is become

harder (their real after-housing income is decreasing). In that sense, extraordinary rent increases not only make housing unaffordable, they increase inequality.

Rental Reform

Given the general affordability struggles of low-income renters which is evident in the above data, in December 2022 SACOSS joined with three other groups in calling for a cap on rental price increases (SACOSS, 2022c). This was in response to the government's discussion paper in review of the *Residential Tenancies Act* – the main South Australian legislation governing relations between tenants and landlords. We believed that the review was not ambitious enough and did not address the fundamental issue of rental affordability. SACOSS's submission argued that rent increases should be capped at CPI (with such a cap also applying to new rentals) (SACOSS, 2022d).

In recent weeks the government has announced several proposals stemming from the review, including limiting rent bidding and decreasing the size of the bond requirements for some renters (Malinauskas, 2023a). These are helpful, but they only impact at the time of rental and do little to address the week-to-week issue of high rental costs. Accordingly, SACOSS still believes that a rent cap pegged to CPI would be a useful contribution to make renting more affordable – but the data above sheds new light on such a proposal in a couple of ways.

The sheer unaffordability of many rentals, and the increasing prices shows the need for a cap on rent increases. However, the fact that the rent for new tenancies is going up way faster than CPI for rents shows the need to include new rentals under a rent cap – a fact also necessitated by not wanting a cap to provide an incentive to evict or not renew leases for existing tenants so that new tenants can be brought in at above-CPI increased rent. That said, the CPI rental data shows that not all landlords are increasing rents by more than inflation, and so would be unaffected by such a cap on rent increases.

Obviously in the detail of design of a rent cap there would need to be flexibility where rents have not gone up for a significant period, or where significant improvements have been made to the property and increased its value, but the general principle of stopping rents from going up by more than the inflation remains important. It may not guarantee rental affordability where rentals are already out of reach for low-income earners, but it will stop the situation getting worse.

Other initiatives will be required to put downward pressure on rents, and SACOSS has long argued that increasing the supply of public and community housing would increase housing supply overall and help to reduce real rents in the private market (as well as providing urgently needed homes to those most marginalized in the housing market). However, until such investments are made and long-term private rentals become more affordable, a cap on rent increases is needed.

Overall though, any such initiative will require political will, and the following section looks at how rental affordability impacts on the political map.

State Electorates

Why State Electorates Matter

Rental prices and affordability vary across Adelaide, and this section shows differences between state electorates based on the ABS data from the last census (ABS, 2022a). We have 5 metrics in the census which show the relative importance of renters and rental affordability by state electorate:

- electorates with relatively high numbers/proportion of renters;
- electorates with relatively high numbers/proportions of low-income renters;
- electorates with the highest median rents;
- electorates with a relatively high proportion of renters paying more than 30% of household income on rent;³ and
- electorates where rent prices went up fastest between the last two censuses.

Both individually and taken together, these give an indication of the electorates where rental affordability issues are likely to hit hardest. The electorate data may not be directly relevant to renters whose locational choices and affordability challenges are not defined by state politics, but it is important in terms of political representation.

While SACOSS expects that all elected MPs work for their communities, and particularly for those in their electorate who have low incomes and/or are struggling with housing affordability, but the electorates identified here are those where the issues of rental affordability are likely to impact on the biggest number of households. Accordingly, it is hoped that the MPs representing these electorates should be champions for the interests of low-income renters.

Numbers of Renters and Low-Income Renters

The table below shows the state electorates in the metropolitan area with a higher proportion of renters and of low-income renters than the median of metropolitan electorates. As can be seen, the lists are similar but not the same. There are changes in order as electorates like Adelaide, Badcoe, West Torrens, Enfield, and Elder have higher proportions of total renters than low-income renters (that is, renters are likely to have relatively higher average incomes in those electorates). The reverse is true for the electorates of Elizabeth, Ramsay, Taylor, Cheltenham and Kaurana where low-income renters make up a relatively higher proportion of the total renters.

Electorates like Dunstan, Florey and Hartley have a relatively high proportion of renters, but below average numbers of low-income renters, while Port Adelaide, Playford and Reynell have a higher than average proportion of low-income renters, but not of renters overall.

³ Note: this is not the standard measure of “housing stress” as the published data relates to all renters, not just those in the lowest two income quintiles (which is part of the definition of housing stress). However, in combination with the other categories used here, the data does provide a window on low-income renters and affordability.

Table 5: State Electorates with the Highest Proportion of Renters

All Renters	% of Electorate	Low Income Renters	% of Electorate
Adelaide	40.4%	Elizabeth	23.4%
Croydon	39.9%	Croydon	23.2%
Badcoe	34.9%	Ramsay	22.7%
Elizabeth	34.0%	Taylor	21.5%
West Torrens	33.5%	Adelaide	21.0%
Ramsay	32.9%	Cheltenham	18.5%
Taylor	32.5%	Kaurna	17.9%
Dunstan	32.1%	Badcoe	17.8%
Enfield	32.0%	Reynell	17.4%
Cheltenham	31.4%	West Torrens	17.1%
Torrens	30.7%	Torrens	16.5%
Morphett	29.9%	Morphett	16.2%
Elder	28.5%	Playford	16.1%
Kaurna	28.1%	Port Adelaide	16.1%
Florey	27.9%	Elder	16.0%
Hartley	27.8%	Enfield	15.9%

Source: SACOSS calculations from ABS (2022a).

Appendix 1 has the data for all Adelaide metropolitan electorates.

Affordability

The table below does a similar ranking exercise, but in relation to affordability. The first column shows the electorates where the proportion of households paying more than 30% of their income is above the median of metropolitan electorates. The second column is those electorates with median rents are at or above the statewide median (\$338p.w.), and the third column is the electorates where rent increased by more than the CPI for Adelaide rents (9.4%) between the 2016 and 2021 censuses.

The electorates in red appear in all three affordability lists.

As well as appearing in the top of these lists, the electorates shown in bold also have an above average number of low-income renters (from Table 5 above). As the table shows, half of the 16 electorates with an above average proportion of households paying more than 30% of their income in rent were also electorates with above-average levels of low-income renters, although only two of these (Adelaide and Kaurna) also had above-average median rents.

By contrast, only 8 of the 22 of the electorates that had seen above-CPI rent increases also had above average proportions of low-income renters – suggesting that rents increased faster in more affluent areas, although there are exceptions with the seat of Elizabeth being the most obvious.

Table 6: Rental Affordability by State Electorate

Rent > 30% of Income	% of Renters	Current Median Rent	\$p.w.	Electorate	% Increase in Median Rent
Adelaide	37.8%	Adelaide	\$406	Enfield	28.3%
Reynell	35.7%	Black	\$391	King	26.0%
Kaurna	35.5%	Waite	\$391	Waite	23.3%
Hurtle Vale	35.4%	Bragg	\$386	Elizabeth	18.2%
Ramsay	34.3%	Unley	\$386	Hartley	17.2%
Elizabeth	33.5%	Morialta	\$380	Colton	16.0%
Taylor	33.4%	Gibson	\$370	Black	15.6%
Elder	32.9%	Davenport	\$370	Elder	14.8%
Cheltenham	32.0%	Colton	\$368	West Torrens	14.3%
Black	31.9%	Hartley	\$359	Dunstan	13.3%
Morphett	31.6%	Enfield	\$359	Cheltenham	13.0%
Hartley	31.4%	Dunstan	\$359	Morialta	12.5%
Port Adelaide	31.4%	Newland	\$349	Bragg	12.3%
Wright	31.2%	Kaurna	\$338	Wright	12.3%
Gibson	31.1%	West Torrens	\$338	Reynell	11.1%
Lee	30.7%	Morphett	\$338	Unley	10.9%
		Wright	\$338	Playford	10.7%
		Florey	\$338	Badcoe	10.7%
				Ramsay	10.2%
				Lee	10.1%
				Newland	10.0%
				Adelaide	9.7%

Source: SACOSS calculations from ABS (2022a)

Note: the median rent is from the 2021 census data, but updated to December 2022 using CPI data.

Again, Appendix 1 has background data and details of all electorates.

Some caution is required with the final column in the table above as the redistribution of state electorates means that some boundaries changed (in a few cases quite significantly) between the 2016 and 2021 censuses. For some electorates the data may not be directly comparable, but for most electorates the differences would only be slight and unlikely to impact the overall findings.

Even with this caveat, a few electorates stand out in this list. The Adelaide electorate had the highest median rents, the highest proportion of renters paying more than 30% of income on rent, and had (slightly) above CPI rent increases. Elizabeth is also a particular concern, as it recorded the fourth highest increase in median rents (18.2%), but also has the highest proportion of low-income renters in the metropolitan area – despite the relatively low median rents (by comparison to other electorates).

By contrast, the electorates of Black and Hartley also have above the average numbers of renters paying more than 30% of their income, and had above-CPI increases in rents, but the proportion of low-income renters in those electorates is below the median of all electorates.

The electorate of Enfield is also of interest for a number of reasons. It had the highest increase in median rent (28.3%), which is a large increase when inflation was generally low. Enfield also has an above-average number of renters and of low-income renters, so the affordability challenges from rapidly rising prices would impact on a relatively wider swathe of the electorate. Finally, the elected representative for Enfield is Andrea Michaels, who, as Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, has carriage of the current reforms to the *Residential Tenancies Act*. The rental data for her electorate suggests a need for big reforms to support renters struggling with high rent prices, but as noted above the reforms proposed by the government are fairly modest.

Top Ten Renter Affordability Electorates

The analysis above can be combined by ranking electorates according to their position on each of the five lists above (Tables 5 and 6). The rankings in each list can then be added together to give an overall ranking. Table 7 shows the top ten renter electorates, that is, the top ten electorates where rental affordability challenges are likely to be felt most. Again, it is then hoped that the representatives of these electorates (also shown in the table) will champion reforms for rental affordability.

Table 7: Top Ten Renter Electorates

Electorate	Elected Representative	Party
Adelaide	Lucy Hood	Labor
Elizabeth	Lee Odenwalder	Labor
Cheltenham	Joe Szakacs	Labor
Hartley	Vincent Tarzia	Liberal
Enfield	Andrea Michaels	Labor
Ramsay	Zoe Bettison	Labor
Kaurana	Chris Picton	Labor
Elder	Nadia Clancy	Labor
West Torrens	Tom Koutsantonis	Labor
Dunstan	Steven Marshall	Liberal

There were a few other notable seats beyond these “top ten”. Reynell (Katrine Hildyard) and Morphett (Steven Patterson) featured in most of the “above-average lists” and ranked 11th and 12th overall, while Opposition Leader David Spier’s seat of Black had relatively high numbers of renters and affordability problems (but with higher average incomes was ranked fourteenth overall).

See Appendix 2 for further information on the methodology and data on all electorates.

Again, if these electorates are those where the issues of rental affordability are likely to impact most, then it is hoped that the MPs representing these electorates would be champions for the interests of renters – and hopefully of low-income renters in particular. Given the current make-up of the parliament and the Ministry, the representatives of these ten electorates include 5 current ministers, the government whip, and a former Premier and former Minister now in Opposition, so there is opportunity for significant voices in parliament on issues of rental affordability. And this is

in addition to those individuals and parties in the Legislative Council who are already advocating on behalf of tenants to reduce rental affordability issues.

Conclusion

This report has documented the problem of rental affordability across metropolitan Adelaide by looking at a range of indicators, primarily the numbers of renters, the proportion of household budgets going to rent, and the changes in rent over time. In doing this, it has largely focused on private market rents, rather than social housing where rent is generally capped at a manageable proportion of income.

However, as noted above, social housing is important in the rental affordability equation – both as provision of secure housing to those most marginalized in the housing market, but also because it adds to market supply, relieves demand on the private market and therefore assists affordability across the rental market. Given this, SACOSS was pleased to see the recent announcement by the government that they were stopping the sell-off of more public housing and was investing to build more public housing – finally turning public housing numbers around after years of decline (Malinauskas, 2023b). That said, while the direction is good, the actual investment is relatively small and by SACOSS' calculation, the numbers of new public houses to be built will not keep pace with projected population growth – that is, public housing may still fall as a proportion of the housing market.

Clearly more investment in public housing will be needed to provide housing and to impact on the private rental market, but until such housing can be built, the private renters need support on a range of issues, including on rental affordability. This includes not just the small reforms proposed by the government in its review of the *Residential Tenancies Act*, but significant new support like rent caps to stop above-CPI rent increases, mandatory disclosure of the energy rating of leased properties and minimum energy efficiency standards to help with the costs of living in those rented houses.

Appendix 1. Background Data for Tables 5 and 6

	Social Housing		Private Renters		Total Renters		Low Income Renters			Affordability		
	Number	% of Electorate	Number	% of Electorate	Number	% of Electorate	Number	% of Renters	% of Electorate	Rent > 30% of Income % of Renters	Median Rent Dec-22	Increase in Median Rent 2016-21
Adelaide	1233	5.2%	8223	35.0%	9496	40.4%	4936	52.0%	21.0%	37.8%	\$406	9.7%
Badcoe	1142	6.1%	5351	28.6%	6539	34.9%	3331	50.9%	17.8%	26.4%	\$328	10.7%
Black	123	0.9%	1967	13.8%	2097	14.7%	945	45.1%	6.6%	31.9%	\$391	15.6%
Bragg	173	1.1%	2742	17.2%	2934	18.4%	1318	44.9%	8.3%	30.0%	\$386	12.3%
Cheltenham	1403	8.1%	3943	22.9%	5404	31.4%	3197	59.2%	18.5%	32.0%	\$322	13.0%
Colton	570	3.5%	3078	18.8%	3674	22.5%	1784	48.6%	10.9%	27.9%	\$368	16.0%
Croydon	2541	13.9%	4676	25.6%	7283	39.9%	4235	58.1%	23.2%	28.3%	\$317	7.1%
Davenport	187	1.3%	1746	12.3%	1950	13.7%	1000	51.3%	7.0%	30.2%	\$370	6.1%
Dunstan	682	3.7%	5234	28.3%	5947	32.1%	2890	48.6%	15.6%	29.3%	\$359	13.3%
Elder	1145	6.7%	3690	21.6%	4865	28.5%	2728	56.1%	16.0%	32.9%	\$328	14.8%
Elizabeth	1579	9.7%	3933	24.1%	5558	34.0%	3813	68.6%	23.4%	33.5%	\$275	18.2%
Enfield	1209	6.8%	4408	25.0%	5652	32.0%	2800	49.5%	15.9%	28.8%	\$359	28.3%
Florey	880	5.5%	3542	22.2%	4449	27.9%	2509	56.4%	15.7%	30.6%	\$338	7.4%
Gibson	1223	6.9%	3501	19.8%	4762	26.9%	2593	54.5%	14.6%	31.1%	\$370	7.7%
Hartley	839	4.8%	3959	22.7%	4841	27.8%	2582	53.3%	14.8%	31.4%	\$359	17.2%
Hurtle Vale	783	5.4%	1911	13.1%	2723	18.6%	1787	65.6%	12.2%	35.4%	\$317	-6.3%
Kaurna	1104	6.3%	3758	21.6%	4895	28.1%	3116	63.7%	17.9%	35.5%	\$338	6.7%
King	761	5.4%	1613	11.4%	2392	16.9%	1445	60.4%	10.2%	28.2%	\$333	26.0%
Lee	1194	7.6%	2732	17.5%	3952	25.3%	2269	57.4%	14.5%	30.7%	\$333	10.1%

	Social Housing		Private Renters		Total Renters		Low Income Renters			Affordability		
	Number	% of Electorate	Number	% of Electorate	Number	% of Electorate	Number	% of Renters	% of Electorate	Rent > 30% of Income % of Renters	Median Rent Dec-22	Increase in Median Rent 2016-21
Morialta	215	1.5%	2289	15.4%	2514	17.0%	1145	45.5%	7.7%	29.8%	\$380	12.5%
Morphett	979	5.6%	4197	24.1%	5200	29.9%	2823	54.3%	16.2%	31.6%	\$338	6.7%
Newland	224	1.5%	2402	15.7%	2648	17.3%	1420	53.6%	9.3%	30.7%	\$349	10.0%
Playford	1023	6.8%	3071	20.4%	4130	27.5%	2428	58.8%	16.1%	30.5%	\$328	10.7%
Port Adelaide	1212	7.1%	3316	19.5%	4558	26.8%	2740	60.1%	16.1%	31.4%	\$317	0.0%
Ramsay	1502	8.8%	4028	23.6%	5597	32.9%	3866	69.1%	22.7%	34.3%	\$285	10.2%
Reynell	998	6.2%	3071	19.1%	4098	25.4%	2799	68.3%	17.4%	35.7%	\$317	11.1%
Taylor	887	5.3%	4452	26.8%	5384	32.5%	3566	66.2%	21.5%	33.4%	\$291	-1.8%
Torrens	1390	7.7%	4094	22.8%	5529	30.7%	2972	53.8%	16.5%	30.4%	\$333	6.8%
Unley	423	2.5%	3809	22.9%	4256	25.6%	1874	44.0%	11.3%	28.7%	\$386	10.9%
Waite	93	0.6%	1508	10.3%	1610	11.0%	746	46.3%	5.1%	30.1%	\$391	23.3%
West Torrens	983	5.9%	4538	27.4%	5559	33.5%	2835	51.0%	17.1%	28.4%	\$338	14.3%
Wright	435	3.0%	1963	13.5%	2411	16.6%	1419	58.9%	9.8%	31.2%	\$338	12.3%
Total	39067	4.8%	153665	19.0%	194202	24.0%	111736	57.5%	13.8%	30.5%	\$317	

Note: the median rent is from the 2021 census data, but updated to December 2022 using CPI data. Further, some electorates changed names (and boundaries) between the 2016 and 2021 censuses. The table above uses the current electorate names, but the 2016 data is source from ABS Census quickstats using the old electorate names.

Appendix 2: Ranking of Renter Electorates

Each electorate was allocated a number equivalent to its rank in each list in the tables, with the electorate at the top of the list allocated 1, down to 32 for the metropolitan electorate at the bottom of the table. The numbers in each list were added together to give an overall score, with the lowest score being those at the top of lists where rental affordability issues are likely to impact most. The following table shows all rankings for all metropolitan electorates.

	% of Renters	Low Income Rent	% Paying >30%	Median Rent	Rent Increases		Total Score		Final Ranking
	Ranking (1 = Highest Impact, 32 – Lowest Impact)								
Adelaide	1	5	1	1	22		30		1
Badcoe	3	8	32	24	18		85		16
Black	30	31	10	2	7		80		14
Bragg	25	28	23	4	13		93		23
Cheltenham	10	6	9	25	11		61		3
Colton	23	24	31	9	6		93		24
Croydon	2	2	29	27	25		85		17
Davenport	31	30	21	8	29		119		32
Dunstan	8	18	25	12	10		73		10
Elder	13	15	8	22	8		66		8
Elizabeth	4	1	6	32	4		47		2
Enfield	9	16	26	11	1		63		5
Florey	15	17	18	18	24		92		21
Gibson	18	20	15	7	23		83		15
Hartley	16	19	12	10	5		62		4
Hurtle Vale	24	22	4	29	32		111		31
Kaurna	14	7	3	14	27		65		7
King	28	25	30	21	2		106		30
Lee	22	21	16	20	20		99		26
Morialta	27	29	24	6	12		98		25
Morphett	12	12	11	16	28		79		12
Newland	26	27	17	13	21		104		28
Playford	17	13	19	23	17		89		19
Port Adelaide	19	14	13	28	30		104		29
Ramsay	6	3	5	31	19		64		6
Reynell	21	9	2	26	15		73		11
Taylor	7	4	7	30	31		79		13
Torrens	11	11	20	19	26		87		18
Unley	20	23	27	5	16		91		20
Waite	32	32	22	3	3		92		22
West Torrens	5	10	28	15	9		67		9
Wright	29	26	14	17	14		100		27

Sources

ABS (2017), *Household Expenditure Survey, Australia: 2015-16*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Table 13.5.

ABS (2022a), *2021 Census of Population and Housing*. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra ACT.

ABS (2022b), *Household Occupancy and Costs Australia, 2019-20*, Australian Bureau of Statistics Tables 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 13.1.

ABS (2023a), *Consumer Price Index, Australia, December 2022*. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

ABS (2023b), *Selected Living Cost Indexes, December 2023*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

Bradbury, B. "The rent crisis is set to spread: here's the case for doubling rent assistance", *The Conversation*, January 11, 2023. <https://theconversation.com/the-rent-crisis-is-set-to-spread-heres-the-case-for-doubling-rent-assistance-196810>

Government of SA (2022) *Private Rent Report, October – December 2021*, (Rental Bond Data Set of the Tenancies Branch, Office of Consumer and Business Services), Adelaide. <https://data.sa.gov.au/data/dataset/private-rent-report>

Government of SA (2023) *Private Rent Report, October – December 2022*, (Rental Bond Data Set of the Tenancies Branch, Office of Consumer and Business Services), Adelaide. <https://data.sa.gov.au/data/dataset/private-rent-report>

Malinauskas, P. (2023a) "Targeted Reforms to Improve Rental Affordability", *Media Release*, Premier of South Australia, 15 February 2023. <https://www.premier.sa.gov.au/media-releases/news-items/targeted-reforms-to-improve-rental-affordability>

Malinauskas, P. (2023b) Labor Commits to First Substantial Public Housing Boost in a Generation" *Media Release*, Premier of South Australia, 14 February 2023. <https://www.premier.sa.gov.au/media-releases/news-items/labor-commits-to-first-substantial-public-housing-boost-in-a-generation>

SACOSS (2022a), *Cost of Living Update No. 49*, December Quarter, 2021, South Australian Council of Social Service, Unley, SA. <https://www.sacoss.org.au/cost-of-living-49>

SACOSS (2022b), *Cost of Living Update No. 50*, June Quarter, 2021, South Australian Council of Social Service, Unley, SA. <https://www.sacoss.org.au/cost-of-living-50>

SACOSS (2022c), "Advocates Call for Rental Price Cap", *Media Release*, 20 December 2023, South Australian Council of Social Service, Adelaide. <https://www.sacoss.org.au/advocates-call-rental-price-cap>

SACOSS (2022d), *Submission to the Residential Tenancies Act Review*, South Australian Council of Social Service, Adelaide. <https://www.sacoss.org.au/submission-RTA-review>

Services Australia (2022), *A guide to Australian Government payments*, Australian Government, Canberra.