

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2247/09-10(06)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 22 June 2010

Updated background brief on work of the Urban Renewal Authority

Purpose

This paper provides updated background information on the progress of work of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and related arrangements, together with 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. URA was set up on 1 May 2001 under the URA Ordinance (Cap. 563) (URAO) passed by the Legislative Council on 27 June 2000. The Ordinance provides for the:

- (a) establishment of URA to replace the Land Development Corporation (LDC) in undertaking urban renewal;
- (b) structure, purposes and powers of URA; and
- (c) procedures for planning and land resumption in respect of redevelopment projects to be implemented by URA.

3. URA would implement the Government's urban renewal strategy by a new proactive approach as the Chief Executive announced in his 1999 Policy Address. 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 meet 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 interests 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. Pursuant to section 20 of URAO, the Administration, having consulted the public from 1 August to 30 September 2001, promulgated an Urban Renewal Strategy (URS) in November 2001. Under section 21 of URAO, URA is required to follow any guidelines set out in URS in preparing its programme of proposals and its programme of implementation for projects.

Approaches to urban renewal

5. According to the Administration and URA, URA adopts a holistic "4R" strategy to regenerate older urban areas and improve the living environment of the residents therein. The "4R" refers to 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

6. Under URAO, URA is required to exercise due care and diligence in handling its finances. 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 exercises the power delegated from the Chief Executive to lease or grant land, and to modify land grants which comply with (a) and (b) above.

7. In accordance with the transitional provisions under URAO, URA has taken over all the assets and liabilities of LDC, including the on-going projects. However, the Administration estimated that URA would incur \$1.7 billion in deficit for implementing the 10 on-going LDC projects, and, accordingly, injected \$10 billion into URA in phases in the five years from 2002-2003 to 2006-2007, with the approval of the Finance Committee on 21 June 2002.

Acquisition and rehousing policies

8. According to URS, although URA may request resumption of land for redevelopment under URAO, 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**.

Progress of work

9. The Administration launched the URS Review in July 2008. The three-stage review was expected to be completed by mid 2010. It is now in the final consensus building stage. A new draft URS is expected to be released by end 2010.

10. In reporting to the Panel on the progress of the work of URA on 23 June 2009, the Administration highlighted the following --

- (a) URA had commenced all the 25 projects announced but not completed by LDC as required by URS;
- (b) URA had announced 44 redevelopment and six preservation cum revitalization projects (to be carried out directly, or through collaboration with the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS)). URA would preserve about 60 historical buildings located within its project areas, and had assisted nearly 500 buildings under its building rehabilitation programmes and carried out area revitalization initiatives in various districts;

- (c) The Financial Secretary approved URA's Corporate Plan (CP) to 2013-2014 and Business Plan (BP) for 2009-2010. The five-year CP included 39 ongoing redevelopment projects and only another 15 would be launched within the next five years, four ongoing preservation projects, a rehabilitation programme covering about 1 000 old buildings, and revitalization initiatives within URA's Action Areas;
- (d) URA's net assets stood at \$9.9 billion as at 31 March 2009. A net operating deficit of \$4.5 billion was recorded in 2008-2009 mainly due to a \$4 billion provision made for the Kwun Tong Town Centre redevelopment project;
- (e) The financial risks associated with redevelopment was considered also greater than before in the light of the exceptionally large outlay required for the implementation of the Kwun Tong Town Centre redevelopment project; and
- (f) URA envisaged that it would have to seek external financing such as bank loans and bond issues, for implementing its urban regeneration programme over the next five years.

Members' concerns and views

11. When discussing the work progress of URA at the Panel meetings held between April 2007 to June 2009, members raised a number of concerns and views. Some of the issues were further discussed at the Panel meetings held on 23 February and 25 May 2010 in connection with the progress of the URS Review.

Role of the Urban Renewal Authority in redevelopment and joint redevelopment

12. Some members criticized that URA had been acting like a private estate developer and overlooked its social responsibilities of improving residents' quality of life. Quoting redevelopment of Lai Sing Court on Tai Hang Road project as a successful example, members suggested that URA could, instead, offer affected owners the option of joint redevelopment when their total land interests reached a certain level. URA could consolidate dispersed land interests of owners who wished to participate in joint redevelopment.

13. URA advised that the feasibility of joint redevelopment with owners would depend on the timeframe of the project concerned, overall planning of the district and affected owners' interests. The Lai Sing Court redevelopment case was an

exception rather than a rule. As the plot ratio of Lai Sing Court was lower than its permitted level, the redevelopment project was profitable through raising the plot ratio. In many of URA's redevelopment projects, the plot ratios had already been fully utilized. In many other cases, such as those 25 projects that had been announced by the former LDC, there was urgency in implementing the priority projects. Private developers could launch redevelopment projects according to market situations but URA had to follow a predetermined timetable.

Financial arrangements and transparency of the Urban Renewal Authority's financial information

14. Some members maintained that while URA should operate on commercial principles and balance its books, it should not make unreasonable profits from its redevelopment projects. In particular, the current arrangements of paying compensation after completion of planning work should be reviewed. A member suggested the Administration should allow flexibility if URA could not balance its books because it needed to meet commitments in preservation, revitalization and rehabilitation projects.

15. It was alleged that URA had compelled property owners to undertake not to disclose acquisition offers, and used divisive tactics in diffusing stakeholders' demands. Some members commented that URA's operations should be more transparent: clear and up-to-date financial results of each redevelopment project should be provided. As the Government had injected \$10 billion into URA, the public should have the right to monitor URA's work and its financial status. The Administration should also tighten up supervision of URA, and, where necessary, URAO should be amended to that effect. One member was of the view that if URA adopted a bottom-up approach to urban renewal, it would not be necessary for URA to withhold information on its planned urban renewal projects to avoid speculation activities.

16. The Administration advised that URA had enhanced its disclosure of financial information already. As URA's operations involved highly sensitive commercial dealings with private developers and affected parties, it should not release all financial information indiscriminately. One member commented that restricting release of the financial results of URA projects would make it difficult for owners to participate in redevelopment. URA advised that owners were not enthusiastic towards URA's previous offer of joint redevelopment with owners.

17. While bond issue was a financing option for URA, Panel members were sceptical whether investors would be interested in buying URA bonds if it carried a higher risk due to a change in operation arising from URS Review. As an alternative, members suggested that URA should either seek bank loans or further

funding injection from the Administration to finance its projects. URA advised that the interest cost of issuing bonds was less expensive than raising bank loans. URA's sound financial status and the expected surpluses from its on-going projects should be attractive to investors; even the \$4 billion loss provision made for the Kwun Tong Town Centre project would not affect URA's long-term corporate credit rating. To help the urban renewal programmes become self-financing in the long run, the Administration injected \$10 billion into URA by phases and offered special land premium arrangements for URA projects.

Acquisition and compensation arrangements

18. Some members considered that the current level of compensation based on the value of a 7-year-old notional flat in the same district was insufficient for an affected owner to purchase a comparable flat within the neighbourhood. They suggested that flat-for-flat and shop-for-shop compensation options should be developed: affected owners could be compensated with a flat of the same size in a designated area, in a standard comparable to that of flats developed by HKHS. Alternatively, they could be compensated with a flat of the same size in the redeveloped building. Cash could be paid upfront to the affected owner to meet the immediate cost of temporary accommodation. The owner could then be offered a unit of the same size in the redeveloped property when it was completed.

19. Some members, however, considered the existing policy workable as it had already struck an appropriate balance, and the flat-for-flat and shop-for-shop compensation options, which appeared just and equitable, might turn out exposing owners and shop operators to higher risks such as fluctuations in the property market.

20. URA advised that flat-for-flat compensation involved practical problems such as the preference of the affected parties on the location and configuration of the replacement units, and the difficulties in holding sufficient housing stock for 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. Many affected owners preferred to receive cash compensation to improve their living environment as soon as possible because they considered the level of cash compensation already very generous. 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.

21. The Administration advised that flat-for-flat compensation option was only feasible when the redevelopment potential was high. However, URA projects might run into deficits if it needed to satisfy its social mission of providing

community facilities in an urban renewal project. There was little room for URA to commit on offering a unit of comparable size to affected owners upon redevelopment.

Rehousing and relocation arrangements

22. Some members suggested that shop operators should be given an option to continue operations in the redeveloped area, at a concessionary rent, whereas more public rental housing units should be provided within the redeveloped area so that affected tenants could remain in the neighbourhood to preserve the existing social network. The Administration should be responsible for providing affordable accommodation to those in need. The responsibility could not be passed on to the market, nor should the Administration refrain from providing further public rental housing just because of local objection. However, a member commented that providing more public rental housing developments in the redeveloped area would increase intensity. The Administration advised that URA would have to rely on HKHS and the Housing Authority to provide public rental housing units to relocate affected residents with housing needs. While URA would make an effort to preserve the social network, given the limited supply of public rental housing units and the local resistance towards proposals for new public rental housing developments, it was difficult for URA to commit on offering rehousing to affected residents in the original district.

Preservation of local characteristics and social fabrics

23. Although URA had carried out some preservation work in its projects, members in general considered the preservation efforts 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. Learning from 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 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 community's growing demand for conservation, 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; and

- (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.

On-going redevelopment projects during the review of the Urban Renewal Strategy

24. Some members were concerned that while URA would continue with its on-going projects during the two-year URS Review, its pace would slow down. They considered that some redevelopment projects were long overdue and should be expedited. On the other hand, some other members cautioned that controversial projects should be put on hold pending further review, and meanwhile, URA should refrain from demolishing buildings of historic values.

25. The Administration advised that URA would focus on less controversial projects, such as those relating to preservation and rehabilitation, during the URS Review. It was in the best interests of the affected parties and the community for URA to proceed along the existing plans and schedule without further ado, 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 or 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. URA had set up social service teams to assist affected parties of individual projects in their relocation. However, social workers in the teams felt that their position as agents of URA might conflict with their role as the affected residents' advocates. One member suggested setting up a fund for the provision of social services to affected residents and for funding social impact assessment and tracking studies.

28. URA advised that two tracking surveys were underway. The stage 1 survey for the Hai Tan Street project covered over 170 households including owners, tenants and commercial operators. Tenants were more responsive and they were mostly concerned about where they were to be relocated. The stage 1 survey for the Kwun Tong Town Centre project covered more than 400 respondents from about

300 households with unexpectedly large number of residents already moved away before the survey commenced.

Recent developments

29. The Administration plans to brief the Panel on the work of URA on 22 June 2010.

Relevant papers

30. A list of relevant papers with their hyperlinks is in **Appendix II**.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
21 June 2010

**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 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 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020301.pdf

Date	Committee / event	References
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.	<p>Discussion paper http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/fc/fc/papers/f00-83e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. FC135/00-01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/fc/fc/minutes/fc300301.pdf</p>
9 July 2001	PLW Panel discussed the work plan, estimated expenditure and pay review of URA.	<p>Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1659/00-01(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a1659e03.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2077/00-01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl090701.pdf</p>
3 October 2001	PLW Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations on the Administration's consultation paper on the draft Urban Renewal Strategy (URS).	<p>Discussion paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2038/00-01(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a2038e01.pdf</p> <p>Consultation paper http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/a1854e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1046/01-02) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl011003.pdf</p> <p>Consultation report http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/plw/papers/report-e.pdf</p>
November 2001	The Administration published the URS.	<p>Urban renewal strategy http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0208-217-1e-scan.pdf</p>

Date	Committee / event	References
22 January and 8 February 2002	PLW Panel discussed the work plans of URA.	<p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p>
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.	<p>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</p> <p>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</p>
31 May 2002	PLW Panel discussed the financial support for URA and the Administration's proposal to inject \$10 billion into URA.	<p>Legislative Council brief http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plb(cr)51_66(2002)viii(eng).pdf</p> <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>

Date	Committee / event	References
		<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)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0531cb1-2026-e.pdf</p>
21 June 2002	<p>FC approved a new commitment of \$10 billion under the Capital Investment Fund for injection as equity into URA.</p>	<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	<p>PLW Panel discussed the work of URA in 2002-2003 and the future work plans of URA.</p>	<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	<p>PLW Panel discussed the progress of the work of URA since April 2003 and its business plan for 2004-2005.</p>	<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>
23 November 2004	<p>PLW Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations the compensation arrangements for land resumption for urban renewal projects.</p>	<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>

Date	Committee / event	References
		<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.	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
July 2006	Information paper on the work of URA was circulated to members of PLW Panel.	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
17 May 2006	A motion on "Review on Urban Renewal Strategy" was debated at the Council. The motion was negatived.	Official Record of Proceedings (Pages 242 to 337) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0517ti-translate-e.pdf
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

Date	Committee / event	References
		<p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1934/06-07) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070423.pdf</p>
26 June 2007	<p>The Administration briefed the PLW Panel on the latest progress of the work of URA.</p>	<p>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</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2304/06-07) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070626.pdf</p>
24 September 2007	<p>PLW Panel further discussed with the Administration the work of URA.</p>	<p>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</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)284/07-08) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070924.pdf</p>
27 November 2007	<p>The Development Panel (DEV Panel) discussed with the Administration the property acquisition policy of URA and related issues.</p>	<p>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</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)606/07-08) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/minutes/de071127.pdf</p>
24 June 2008	<p>DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of URS and the work of URA.</p>	<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 the Urban Renewal Authority (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>

Date	Committee / event	References
17 July 2008	The Development Bureau formally launched a review of URS on 17 July 2008.	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
20 January 2009	The Panel discussed with the Administration the review of URS.	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 Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(09)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0120cb1-570-9-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1948/08-09) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20090120.pdf
15 April 2009	The Panel received public views on the review of URS.	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 Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(09)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0120cb1-570-9-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2772/08-09) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20090415.pdf
23 June 2009	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the progress of the work of URA.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1947/08-09(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0623cb1-1947-3-e.pdf Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)1947/08-09(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0623cb1-1947-4-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2515/08-09) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20090623.pdf

Date	Committee / event	References
23 February 2010	The Panel discussed with the Administration the review of URS.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1157/09-10(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0223cb1-1157-3-e.pdf Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)1157/09-10(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0223cb1-1157-4-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1712/09-10) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20100223.pdf
25 May 2010	The Panel discussed with the Administration the review of URS.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1919/09-10(07)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0525cb1-1919-7-e.pdf Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)1919/09-10(08)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0525cb1-1919-8-e.pdf