

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1947/08-09(04)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 23 June 2009

Background brief on the Urban Renewal Authority

Purpose

The Administration will brief the Panel on Development (the Panel) on the progress of work of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) on 23 June 2009. This paper provides background information on the establishment of URA and related arrangements, and a summary of members' concerns and views expressed during the relevant Panel discussions in recent years.

Establishment of the Urban Renewal Authority and promulgation of the Urban Renewal Strategy in 2001

2. The Land Development Corporation (LDC) was set up in 1988 as a statutory body to carry out urban renewal projects. Under section 10 of the repealed Land Development Corporation Ordinance (Cap. 15), LDC had to conduct its business according to prudent commercial principles. Although LDC had successfully completed a number of redevelopment projects, it had experienced some major difficulties in pursuing its redevelopment programme, including --

- (a) the original assumption that urban renewal could be wholly self-financing might not be valid as a result of a scarcity of sites for profitable redevelopment and a less exuberant property market;
- (b) the need by law to undertake protracted negotiations with property owners had prolonged the land assembly process and increased the financial burden of LDC's projects; and

- (c) with a commitment not to make anyone affected by redevelopment projects homeless, the scope of urban renewal had been restrained by LDC's shortage of rehousing resources.

3. Following a public consultation exercise conducted in 1995 and an urban renewal strategy study completed by the Planning Department in 1999, the Chief Executive announced in his 1999 Policy Address a new and proactive approach to urban renewal and a plan to establish URA to implement Government's urban renewal strategy. Under the new approach, the Government would plan urban redevelopment and rehabilitation more rigorously and comprehensively for larger areas, with a view to restructuring and replanning more effectively the older built-up areas, redesigning more effective and environmentally-friendly transport and road networks, replacing incompatible land uses, providing more open space and community facilities, and designing buildings which met the demands of modern living. The Government would also plan for the rehabilitation of buildings not in good repair and the preservation of buildings of historical, cultural or architectural interest in the project areas. Under-utilized industrial areas should also be included in the urban renewal programme so as to rationalize incompatible land uses and re-vitalize economic activities within these areas.

4. On 22 October 1999, the Government published in the Gazette the Urban Renewal Authority Bill in the form of a White Bill for public consultation. The Subcommittee formed by the House Committee to study the White Bill submitted its report to the House Committee on 11 February 2000.

5. The URA Blue Bill was gazetted on 3 February 2000. The objects of the Bill were --

- (a) to establish a new statutory body, named URA, to replace LDC, for the purpose of undertaking urban renewal;
- (b) to provide for the structure, purposes and powers of URA; and
- (c) to set out the procedures for planning and land resumption in respect of redevelopment projects to be implemented by URA.

The Bill was passed by the Legislative Council on 27 June 2000.

6. The URA was established on 1 May 2001. Pursuant to section 20 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (Cap. 563) (URAO), the Administration consulted the public on a draft URS from 1 August to 30 September 2001. Over a hundred submissions were received. The draft URS was revised taking into account the comments received and the URS was promulgated by the Government

in November 2001. Under section 21 of URAO, URA is required to follow any guidelines set out in the URS in preparing its programme of proposals and its programme of implementation for projects.

Approaches to urban renewal

7. According to the Administration and URA, URA adopts a holistic "4R" strategy to regenerate our older urban areas and improve the living environment of the residents therein, i.e. redevelopment of dilapidated buildings, rehabilitation of poorly maintained buildings, revitalization of socio-economic and environmental fabric of older districts and preservation of buildings with historical and architectural significance.

Financial arrangements

8. Under URAO, URA is required to exercise due care and diligence in handling its finances. At the time the URS was promulgated, the Government had not yet finalized the financial arrangements for URA. On 7 May 2002, the Chief Executive in Council ordered that --

- (a) all urban renewal sites for new projects set out in URA's corporate plans and business plans, approved by the Financial Secretary from time to time, may in principle be granted to URA at minimal premium, subject to satisfying the Financial Secretary of the need therefor;
- (b) sites for meeting rehousing requirements for URA as identified in the approved corporate plans and business plans may in principle be made available at nominal premium, subject to satisfying the Financial Secretary of the need therefor; and
- (c) in future, the Director of Lands exercise the power delegated from the Chief Executive to lease or grant land, and to modify land grants which are in compliance with (a) and (b) above.

9. In accordance with the transitional provisions under URAO, URA has taken over all the assets and liabilities of LDC, including the on-going projects. The then Panel on Planning, Lands and Works noted at the meeting on 31 May 2002 that URA had not started in a strong financial position and estimated that the total deficit for implementing the 10 on-going projects of the LDC would amount to around \$1.7 billion upon their completion. Against this background, the Administration proposed to inject \$10 billion into URA in phases in the five years from 2002-2003

to 2006-2007. The Administration's proposal was subsequently approved by the Finance Committee on 21 June 2002.

Acquisition and rehousing policies

10. According to the URS, although URA may request resumption of land for redevelopment under URSO, it should consider acquiring land by agreement before making such a request to the Secretary for Development. Offers of purchase should be made after a project has been approved but before the land reverts to the Government. Details of URA's acquisition and rehousing policies, as advised by URA in a paper for the Panel on Development in November 2007, are given in **Appendix I**. According to the information provided by URA in June 2008, the average acceptance rate of URA's acquisition offers in commenced projects was about 81%.

Recent developments

11. In reporting to the Panel on the progress of the work of URA in June 2008, the Administration highlighted the following --

- (a) With the commencement of the last three redevelopment projects inherited from the former Land Development Corporation (ex-LDC) in 2007-08, the URA had commenced all the 25 ex-LDC projects;
- (b) Following the relevant announcements by the Chief Executive in his 2007-2008 Policy Address, URA had supported the Development Bureau to adopt a district-based approach to revitalize the older parts of Wan Chai. URA was also working on a strategy to preserve up to 48 pre-war shophouses of Cantonese verandah-type through various means;
- (c) The five-year Corporate Plan of the URA for 2008/09 – 2012/13, as approved by the Financial Secretary, comprised 23 new redevelopment projects and 1 new preservation project; a rehabilitation programme covering about 1,000 old buildings; and revitalization initiatives within URA's Action Areas which are integrated with the redevelopment projects and rehabilitation programme. Besides, the URA would continue to take forward on-going redevelopment projects.

- (d) URA's net assets stood at \$14.4 billion as at 31 March 2008. Notwithstanding the present healthy financial situation, the URA had indicated that it would be increasingly difficult to balance its books due to the increased commitments in preservation, revitalization and rehabilitation.

12. The Administration launched the URS Review in July 2008 and has advised that the Review will take two years to complete, during which URA will devote a lot of attention and resources to the Review.

Members' concerns and views expressed during recent discussions of the Panel

13. At a number of meetings of the Panel held between April 2007 to April 2009, the work progress of URA, its acquisition and rehousing policies, and the URS Review were discussed. The Panel received public views on the URS Review at the meeting on 15 April 2009. Members' major concerns and views regarding the work of URA expressed during these discussions are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

Financial and acquisition arrangements

14. Some members criticized that URA had been acting like a private estate developer and had overlooked its responsibilities as a public body entrusted with the mission of improving the quality of life of residents in the urban area. Some other members appreciated that urban renewal was a complicated task and often involved conflicting interests. They considered it most important to balance the interests and needs of all sectors of the community without sacrificing the lawful rights of any particular group as stated in the URS.

15. Some individual members expressed the following views --

- (a) Although URA should balance its books, it should not make unreasonable profits from its redevelopment projects.
- (b) The present arrangements that URA would not pay compensation before completion of planning work required a fundamental review.
- (c) Affected parties should be given options, such as flat-for-flat and shop-for-shop compensation and owners' participation in joint redevelopment.

- (d) Compensation based on the value of a 7-year-old notional flat was insufficient for purchasing a comparable flat within the same district under most circumstances.
- (e) The present compensation arrangement of making acquisition offers based on the value of a comparable 7-year-old notional flat had already struck an appropriate balance and the policy should still be workable.
- (f) In view of the allegations of malpractices adopted by URA in the acquisition process, such as compelling owners to sign confidentiality undertakings regarding acquisition offers and using divisive tactics in handling stakeholders' demands, the Administration should consider tightening up its monitoring over URA's work. Where necessary, the URAO should be amended to provide for adequate checks over URA's powers.

16. Regarding the suggestion of "flat-for-flat" and "shop-for-shop" compensation, URA had advised that this involved practical problems such as preference of the affected parties on the location and configuration of the replacement units, and the difficulties in holding sufficient housing stock for yet to be affected residents. Cash compensation was considered by most people affected to be the most flexible option in allowing affected parties to purchase a unit of their own choice. Besides, URA staff and social workers from the Social Service Teams engaged by URA for individual projects would provide assistance to affected parties in locating suitable units.

Joint redevelopment with affected owners

17. According to URA, the feasibility of joint redevelopment with owners would depend on the timeframe of the project concerned, overall planning for the district and interest from affected owners. As joint redevelopment was a long-term investment with high risks, not all affected owners would be interested in such an arrangement. In the past, the joint redevelopment arrangement had only been implemented in one project at Hanoi Road of the former LDC where there was a major owner who had acquired a number of land interests with market value of more than 70% of the total. For the Nga Tsin Wai Village project, URA had invited small property owners to indicate whether they would be interested in participating in joint redevelopment, but most of them were not interested. Given that a major owner developer had acquired about 70% of the land interests, joint redevelopment with that developer would be a practical arrangement.

18. Some members expressed the view that it should be possible for URA to adopt the same approach for other redevelopment projects by consolidating the dispersed land interests from owners who wanted to participate in joint redevelopment. It was unfair if only major owners could participate in joint redevelopment. URA should have transparent criteria in this regard, such as offering the option of joint redevelopment to affected owners when the total percentage of land interests of those owners interested in this option had reached a certain level.

19. URA responded that URA's cash compensation was very generous and flexible, and many affected owners preferred to receive cash compensation to improve their living environment as soon as possible. The enhancement measure introduced in November 2007 whereby affected owners were invited to express interest in purchasing redeveloped residential units was to cater for those affected owners who wished to purchase units in the same area where they once lived.

20. Some members referred to the Lai Sing Court private redevelopment project on Tai Hang Road, and commented that the project was successful, profitable and implemented through negotiation between the developer and affected owners. URA explained that the plot ratio of the site of the Lai Sing Court redevelopment project had not been fully utilized before redevelopment, thus making the redevelopment project profitable through raising the plot ratio. The project had also taken a long time to complete. For URA's redevelopment projects, the circumstances were different. The plot ratios of some sites had already been fully utilized and there was urgency in implementing the priority projects (i.e. those 25 projects that had been announced by the former LDC). Private developers could launch redevelopment projects according to market situations but URA had to follow a predetermined timetable.

Preservation of local characteristics and social fabrics

21. Although URA had carried out some preservation work in its projects, members in general considered that the preservation efforts were inadequate and should be stepped up. The following views were expressed by individual members in this regard --

- (a) Urban renewal should provide room for the continued existence of traditional trades. Borrowing the experience of Singapore, consideration could be given to inviting owners of old shops to operate their business in the redeveloped areas.

- (b) URA should step up its efforts in revitalizing old districts. By way of illustration, many bazaars in Yau Ma Tei, Tsim Sha Tsui and Mong Kok had not been revitalized.
- (c) Given the growing demand for conservation from the society, URA might not be able to carry out urban renewal work if the Administration did not provide it with sufficient resources, whether directly or indirectly.
- (d) URA's approach to urban renewal was not people-oriented and did not take into account the social ecology and networks of the affected districts.

Transparency of URA's financial information

22. Some members considered that URA should be a highly transparent public organization operating not on commercial values and principles, but for the benefits of the community. As such, URA should provide Members and the general public with clear and up-to-date financial results of each redevelopment project.

23. The Administration responded that since the operation of URA involved highly sensitive information on commercial dealings with private developers and affected parties, it would not be advisable to release indiscriminately all financial information. However, URA would provide financial information and analysis of its financial position on a yearly basis.

URS Review and on-going redevelopment projects launched by URA during the Review

24. Members noted that while the URS Review would take about two years to complete, URA would continue with its on-going projects in accordance with the existing policies. Some members were concerned that the pace of urban renewal would be slowed down during the two-year review period. They considered that some redevelopment projects were long overdue and should be implemented as soon as practicable. On the other hand, some other members expressed the view that those controversial projects such as H19 in Central and the Sai Yee Street project in Mong Kok should be put on hold for further review. URA should refrain from demolishing buildings of historic values during the review period.

25. The Administration advised that URA would focus on less controversial projects, for instance those relating to preservation and rehabilitation, during the review period. It was in the best interests of the affected parties and the community for URA to adhere to the existing plans and schedule in completing the

commenced projects and the sooner the better, given that the implementation of these projects had gone through a lot of difficulties.

Social impact assessment, tracking studies and social service teams

26. Under the existing URS, URA is required to conduct a non-obtrusive social impact assessment before, and another detailed social impact assessment after a proposed project has been published in the Government Gazette. Some members considered that the Administration/URA should also conduct tracking studies on residents affected by urban renewal projects and on those living in nearby areas. Such studies could reveal how far the social networks of affected residents could be maintained and re-housing in the same district could be achieved.

27. A member pointed out that some social workers of URA's social service teams felt that they were under pressure because the organizations they worked for were engaged by URA to provide assistance to affected residents to facilitate the implementation of urban redevelopment projects. The member suggested setting up a fund for the provision of social services to affected residents and for funding social impact assessment and tracking studies.

Relevant papers

28. A list of relevant papers is in **Appendix II**.

**Acquisition and rehousing policies of the Urban Renewal Authority
(extracted from LC Paper No. CB(1)297/07-08(04))**

* * * * *

2. The URA's acquisition policies are based on the Government's resumption policy which was debated and agreed by the Legislative Council's Finance Committee, after considerable discussion. However, URA's policies include more generous incentives than Government's resumption policy, such as an ex-gratia Incidental Costs Allowance (ICA), so as to encourage early acceptance of URA's offers.

3. Briefly, the policies for domestic owners comprise payment of the market value of the property plus Home Purchase Allowance (HPA) or Supplementary Allowance (SA). HPA is the difference between the value of a notional replacement flat, based on a seven year old flat in a similar locality, and the market value of the flat under acquisition. This has become known commonly as the "seven-year rule". HPA is paid to owner-occupiers. SA is paid to owners of tenanted and vacant flats at 50% of HPA.

4. The policies for domestic tenants comprise a choice of either ex-gratia payments based on the Rateable Values (RV) of the flats which they occupy plus cash incentives or, in cases where the tenants are eligible and prefer it, rehousing in public housing estates. Ex-gratia payments are subject to a minimum of \$70,000 for a single-member family and \$80,000 for a multiple-member family. Moreover, in response to LegCo's concerns over the compensation payable to domestic tenants in the remaining ex-Land Development Corporation projects during the passage of the Landlord and Tenant (Consolidation) (Amendment) Ordinance 2004, the URA has also agreed to provide eligible tenants with ex-gratia payments calculated on the basis of the previous formula in force before the enactment of the Ordinance.

5. The policies applicable to non-domestic owners and tenants are based on the Market Values (MV) and RV of their respective premises. Business owner-operators receive compensation equal to the MV plus the higher of either 35% x MV or 4 x RV. Alternatively, owner-operators can make Business Loss Claims (BLC) in lieu of the above mentioned ex-gratia compensation. Business landlords receive compensation of the MV plus the higher of either 10% x MV or 1RV. Business tenant-operators receive compensation of either BLC or 3RV.

6. Detailed information on URA's acquisition and rehousing policy is given by the URA, along with other information, to affected owners and tenants at the times when the URA launches each of its projects and conducts occupancy or freezing surveys on all of the properties within the boundaries of each of the URA's projects.

* * * * *

9. On 19 November 2007, the URA announced a new package of enhancement policies for the benefit of residents and business operators affected by its redevelopment projects. These new initiatives, which were designed under the existing policy framework, respond to aspirations and concerns of the affected residents and the community. They have three important objectives, namely, to help retain the social networks of residents as much as practicable, to assist long-time business operators in re-establishing themselves in the locality and to preserve retail trades that are considered to have a special character in a district. The enhancement package comprises:

- (i) expression of interest in purchasing arrangement for residential units;
- (ii) designation of space exclusively for the purpose of social enterprise for commenced projects;
- (iii) additional ex-gratia business allowance for business operators; and
- (iv) special Local Sports Shops Arrangement for the Sai Yee Street project.

10. The first enhancement policy, expression of interest in purchasing arrangement (EIPA), is intended for owner-occupiers of domestic flats in a redevelopment site to facilitate their purchasing of new units at prevailing market prices and moving back to the same area where they once lived. Owner-occupiers, who accept the URA's acquisition offers unconditionally within the usual 60-day offer period and register their interest with the URA within this period, will be given priority, subject to the number of available units, to apply for selection by balloting from the reserved flats prior to commencement of pre-sale of the development concerned, subject to this being permitted under the land grant. This will help enable them to retain their social networks and lifestyles in the same neighbourhood. Whether they accept this arrangement or not, their entitlement to receiving Home Purchase Allowance based on the existing "seven-year rule" acquisition policy, i.e. the value of a notional seven-year-old flat, will remain unchanged.

11. The second enhancement policy, designation of space for social enterprises, aims at helping affected residents re-establish and strengthen their social networks in the district. For sizeable projects in which allocation of space is possible, URA will consider reserving floor space for non-government organizations (NGOs) to make bids for the purpose of operating social enterprises involving active participation of residents and shop operators of the projects concerned. Details of this policy are still being worked out but URA intends to try it out first in the Lee Tung Street and Peel Street/Graham Street projects. With experience thus gained, URA may consider extending this policy to other suitable projects.

12. The third enhancement policy, in the form of an additional payment of ex-gratia business allowance (EGBA) is designed to enhance the overall amount payable to all businesses operating out of non-domestic properties within a redevelopment project area i.e. owner-operators and tenant-operators. This new allowance is payable in addition to the existing compensation whereby owner-operators receive cash payment equivalent to the MV of their properties plus the higher of either 35% x MV or 4 RV of their properties, and tenant-operators receive cash payment of 3 RV. EGBA will be paid at a rate of 0.1 times the RV per year for a maximum of 30 years so that a business with 30 years' history or more will enjoy a maximum of three times the RV. The maximum amount of allowance payable is capped at \$500,000. To ensure that businesses operators occupying small units or with a not-so-long history would also benefit to some extent, the policy provides a minimum allowance of \$70,000 to any eligible business operator.

13. The fourth enhancement policy concerning Local Sports Shops Arrangement aims at preserving the special local character created by a cluster of sports commodities retail trades in the to-be-commenced Sai Yee Street project of Mong Kok. URA shares the views expressed by members of the Legislative Council, the community and, in particular, the affected sports shop operators that efforts should be made to preserve, and if possible enhance, the local character of this district. URA will therefore introduce a special Local Sports Shops Arrangement exclusively for the Sai Yee Street project, in conjunction with a "Sports Retail City" design which will further strengthen the local character of this neighbourhood. Under the arrangement, all 19 sports shop operators in the project site will be offered priority to lease shop spaces on the ground and upper floors of the retail section of the new development, for periods of up to three years, at the then prevailing market rental level. Details of this arrangement are being worked out and will be announced upon formal commencement of the project before the end of this financial year.

14. These enhancements have been devised in response to the community's changing needs and aspirations, taking into account existing practical and resources constraints. They have been introduced on the basis of the compensation policy for land resumption approved by the Legislative Council's Finance Committee in 2001.

In this context, the 2001 policy, which has been tried and proven effective in many redevelopment projects in the past six years, must remain as the URA's fundamental policy.

* * * * *

Work of the Urban Renewal Authority

List of relevant events and papers

Date	Committee / event	References
21 October 1999	The Administration announced the proposal to set up a new institutional framework to replace the Land Development Corporation to tackle the problems of urban deterioration and the publication of an Urban Renewal Authority (URA) White Bill for public consultation.	Administration's press release http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/199910/21/1021136.htm Legislative Council Brief http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/hc/sub_com/hs01/papers/lcb_e.pdf
11 February 2000	The Subcommittee set up to scrutinize the URA White Bill reported its deliberations to the House Committee.	Report of the Subcommittee (LC Paper No. CB(1)939/99-00) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/hc/papers/cb1-939.pdf Minutes of meeting of House Committee (LC Paper No. CB(2)1085/99-00) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/hc/minutes/hc110200.pdf
3 February 2000	Gazettal of the URA Blue Bill	Legislative Council Brief http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/bc/bc09/general/89_brf.pdf

Date	Committee / event	References
23 June 2000	The Bills Committee set up to scrutinize the URA Blue Bill reported to the House Committee.	Report of the Bills Committee (LC Paper No. CB(1)1924/99-00) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/bc/bc09/reports/a1924.pdf
26 and 27 June 2000	The URA Blue Bill was passed by the Council.	Official Record of Proceedings http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/counmtg/hansard/000626fe.pdf http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/counmtg/hansard/000627fa.pdf
6 November 2000	The Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) discussed the progress of the establishment of URA.	Discussion paper http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a115e03.pdf Follow-up paper on "Property Acquisition by the Land Development Corporation and Land Resumption by the Government" http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a288e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)352/00-01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl061100.pdf
27 February, 1 and 2 March 2001	PLW Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations on the compensation arrangements for land resumption for urban renewal projects.	Discussion papers (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)630/00-01(01) and (02)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a630e01.pdf http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a630e02.pdf The Administration's response to views expressed by some members/deputations http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a788e.pdf Minutes of meetings (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)2063, 2045 and 2047/00-01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl270201.pdf http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl010301.pdf

Date	Committee / event	References
		http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020301.pdf
10 March 2001	The Finance Committee (FC) approved the proposals to revise the Home Purchase Allowance, Supplementary Allowance and ex-gratia allowance for owners and tenants affected by land resumption.	Discussion paper http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/fc/fc/papers/f00-83e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. FC135/00-01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/fc/fc/minutes/fc300301.pdf
9 July 2001	PLW Panel discussed the work plan, estimated expenditure and pay review of URA.	Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1659/00-01(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a1659e03.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2077/00-01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl090701.pdf
3 October 2001	PLW Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations on the Administration's consultation paper on the draft Urban Renewal Strategy (URS).	Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2038/00-01(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a2038e01.pdf Consultation paper http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a1854e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1046/01-02) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl011003.pdf Consultation report

Date	Committee / event	References
		http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/report-e.pdf
November 2001	The Administration published the URS.	Urban renewal strategy http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0208-217-1e-scan.pdf
22 January and 8 February 2002	PLW Panel discussed the work plans of URA.	Discussion papers (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)825/01-02(01) and 1011/01-02(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0122cb1-825-1e.pdf http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0208cb1-1011-1e.pdf Paper on "Undertakings made by the Administration in respect of urban renewal" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (LC Paper No. CB(1)843/01-02(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0122cb1-843-1e.pdf Minutes of meetings (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1962 and 1442/01-02) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020122.pdf http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020208.pdf
25 January 2002	PLW Panel presented a report to the House Committee reflecting Members' concern about the delay in the implementation of the 25 uncompleted projects of the Land Development Corporation.	Paper to House Committee (LC Paper No. CB(1)900/01-02) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/hc/papers/hc0125cb1-900.pdf Minutes of meeting of House Committee (LC Paper No. CB(2)1014/01-02) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/hc/minutes/hc020125.pdf
31 May 2002	PLW Panel discussed the financial support for URA	Legislative Council brief http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plb(cr)51_66(2002)viii(eng).pdf

Date	Committee / event	References
	and the Administration's proposal to inject \$10 billion into URA.	<p>Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1828/01-02(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0531cb1-1828-1e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)538/02-03) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020531.pdf</p> <p>Supplementary information related to the acquisition of properties by URA in the three "early launch" projects: provided by the Administration after the meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2026/01-02) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0531cb1-2026-e.pdf</p>
21 June 2002	FC approved a new commitment of \$10 billion under the Capital Investment Fund for injection as equity into URA.	<p>Financial proposal http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/fc/fc/papers/f02-24e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. FC21/02-03) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/fc/fc/minutes/fc020621.pdf</p>
2 May 2003	PLW Panel discussed the work of URA in 2002-2003 and the future work plans of URA.	<p>Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1485/02-03(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0502cb1-1485-4e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1832/02-03) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl030502.pdf</p>
29 June 2004	PLW Panel discussed the progress of the work of URA since April 2003 and its business plan for 2004-2005.	<p>Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2221/03-04(05)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0629cb1-2221-5e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2487/03-04) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl040629.pdf</p>

Date	Committee / event	References
23 November 2004	PLW Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations the compensation arrangements for land resumption for urban renewal projects.	<p>Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)263/04-05(02)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1123cb1-263-2e.pdf</p> <p>Background brief prepared by the Secretariat (LC Paper No. CB(1)263/04-05(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1123cb1-263-3e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)509/04-05) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl041123.pdf</p> <p>Follow-up paper on "Assessment of Home Purchase Allowance rates for Urban Renewal Authority projects" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1202/04-05(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1123cb1-1202-1e.pdf</p>
July 2005	Information paper on the work of URA was circulated to members of PLW Panel.	<p>Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2019/04-05(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-2019-1e.pdf</p>
July 2006	Information paper on the work of URA was circulated to members of PLW Panel.	<p>Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2013/05-06(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-2013-1e.pdf</p>
17 May 2006	A motion on "Review on Urban Renewal Strategy" was debated at the Council. The motion was negated.	<p>Official Record of Proceedings (Pages 242 to 337) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0517ti-translate-e.pdf</p>

Date	Committee / event	References
7 February 2007	An oral question was raised on "urban renewal strategy".	Official Record of Proceedings (Pages 45 to 55) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0207-translate-e.pdf
23 April 2007	PLW Panel discussed with the Administration the progress of the work of URA.	Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1184/06-07(07)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0327cb1-1184-7-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1934/06-07) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070423.pdf
26 June 2007	The Administration briefed the PLW Panel on the latest progress of the work of URA.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1940/06-07(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0626cb1-1940-3-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2304/06-07) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070626.pdf
24 September 2007	PLW Panel further discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2371/06-07(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0924cb1-2371-1-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)284/07-08) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070924.pdf
27 November 2007	The Development Panel (DEV Panel) discussed with the Administration the property acquisition policy of URA and related issues.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)297/07-08(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/dev1127cb1-297-4-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)606/07-08) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/minutes/de071127.pdf

Date	Committee / event	References
24 June 2008	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the Urban Renewal Strategy and the work of URA.	<p>Information paper on Review of the Urban Renewal Strategy (LC Paper No. CB(1)1951/07-08(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/dev0624cb1-1951-3-e.pdf</p> <p>Information paper on the work of URA (LC Paper No. CB(1)1951/07-08(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/dev0624cb1-1951-4-e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. LC Paper No. CB(1)2322/07-08) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/minutes/de080624.pdf</p>
17 July 2008	The Development Bureau formally launched a review of the URS on 17 July 2008.	<p>Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2193/07-08(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/devcb1-2193-1-e.pdf</p>
20 January 2009	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the progress of the URS Review.	<p>Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(08)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0120cb1-570-8-e.pdf</p>
15 April 2009	DEV Panel received public views on the URS Review.	<p>Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1240/08-09(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0415cb1-1240-1-e.pdf</p>