

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2530/10-11(04)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 28 June 2011

**Updated background brief on
the work of the Urban Renewal Authority**

Purpose

This paper provides background information on the work of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), the review of the Urban Renewal Strategy ("URS") and a summary of members' concerns and views expressed during discussions at the Panel on Development ("the Panel").

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

2. To tackle the emerging problem of urban decay in Hong Kong, the Administration set up the Land Development Corporation ("LDC") in 1988 to carry out urban renewal projects according to prudent commercial principles. Although LDC had successfully completed a number of redevelopment projects, it encountered major difficulties during the process, including small size of sites to allow profitable returns from redevelopment projects, long time taken to assemble land interests for redevelopment due to protracted negotiation process with property owners, and constrained scope of urban renewal due to LDC's shortage of re-housing resources for affected residents.

3. Following a public consultation exercise in 1995 and an URS study by the Planning Department in 1999, the Chief Executive ("CE") announced in his 1999-2000 Policy Address a new and proactive approach to urban renewal

and a plan to establish an URA to implement the URS. Under the new approach, the Administration would plan urban redevelopment and rehabilitation more rigorously and comprehensively for larger areas. The objectives were to restructure and replan older built-up areas more effectively, by 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 Administration 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.

4. URA was established on 1 May 2001 following the enactment of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (Cap. 563) ("URAO") in June 2000. The Administration promulgated URS in November 2001 after a two-month public consultation on the draft URS. Under section 21 of URAO, URA is required to follow the guidelines set out in URS in undertaking redevelopment projects¹.

Review of the Urban Renewal Strategy from 2008 to 2010

5. Between 2001 and 2008, URA commenced 35 redevelopment projects together with the Hong Kong Housing Society (including 10 new redevelopment projects and 25 projects taken over from LDC). A target of commencing 225 redevelopment projects in 20 years was also set. However, a number of issues came to light during the implementation process. These issues which aroused public concern included the approaches adopted by URA for urban renewal, its compensation policies, the outturn built environment of completed projects, and the way URA gauged stakeholders' views and conciliated conflicts in the project planning and acquisition processes. To address these concerns, the Panel held a series of meetings with the Administration and URA to discuss URA's work and its acquisition and re-housing policies in 2007 to 2008².

¹ The full text of the URS issued in November 2001 is available at the following hyperlink: <http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0208-217-1e-scan.pdf>.

² Details of URA's acquisition and re-housing policies, as advised by URA in a paper for the Panel in November 2007, are available at the following hyperlink: <http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/dev1127cb1-297-4-e.pdf>.

6. On 24 June 2008, the Administration informed the Panel that a comprehensive review on URS would be launched in response to CE's call for "quality city, quality life" and the rising aspiration of the general public towards urban renewal. The Administration's objective was to renew URS through a two-year review to establish guiding principles for URA's future work. The review covered a three-stage process involving "envisioning" (July 2008 to January 2009) which was a study on urban renewal policies and practices in six comparable Asian cities, "public engagement" (February 2009 to December 2009) where views of Hong Kong people on the future direction of urban regeneration were gauged, and "consensus building" (January 2010 to June 2010) for achieving a consensus to come up with a revised URS. A Steering Committee chaired by the Secretary for Development and consisting of 10 non-official members drawn from various fields was set up to guide and monitor the review process, as well as develop recommendations. The Administration briefed the Panel on the progress of the URS review at meetings on 20 January 2009, 23 February 2010 and 25 May 2010. The Panel also received views from deputations on 15 April 2009 and 10 July 2010.

Draft text of the revised Urban Renewal Strategy

7. On 13 October 2010, URA published a draft text of the revised URS incorporating the broad consensus built during the two-year review for a two-month public consultation³. The revised URS covering 10 key recommendations are summarized as follows --

- (a) *URS as a government strategy with URA, stakeholders and other participants playing their respective roles* -- Diversified urban renewal comprising the 4Rs (i.e. redevelopment, rehabilitation, heritage preservation and revitalization) should not only be undertaken by URA, but also by other stakeholders including relevant Government bureaux and departments, relevant District

³ The full text of the draft URS is available at Annex A to the Legislative Council Brief on "People First: A District-based and Public Participation Approach to Urban Renewal -- Urban Renewal Strategy Review" issued by the Administration in October 2010 (<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1026-devbplcr115077-e.pdf>).

Councils, the Hong Kong Housing Society, private developers, building owners, professionals and non-governmental organizations.

- (b) *Setting up of District Urban Renewal Forum ("DURF")* -- A new advisory platform, DURF, will be set up in the old urban districts to strengthen urban renewal at the planning stage with a "people-centred", "bottom-up" and "district-based" approach. DURF will be appointed by Government and chaired by a professional familiar with urban renewal issues. It will be separate from the District Councils. The Planning Department will provide secretariat and professional support to DURF. DURF is expected to provide advice to URA, Government departments and other relevant bodies on the district's urban renewal proposals from a holistic and integrated perspective taking account of local characteristics. It will conduct broad-based public engagement activities and various planning and related studies, including social impact assessments before any urban redevelopment projects are proposed.
- (c) *Redevelopment and rehabilitation as URA's core business* -- While the macro approach of urban regeneration should continue to be based on the 4R strategy, URA should focus on rehabilitation and redevelopment in future.
- (d) *URA's role in preservation and revitalization* -- In future, URA's heritage preservation should in principle be confined to within its redevelopment project areas. URA will make reference to the Government's policy on heritage conservation in pursuing its heritage preservation projects and URA would give due emphasis to collaborative partnership with non-profit-making organizations and enhanced opportunities for the public to enjoy the use of those revitalized historic buildings. URA will contribute ideas on revitalization and will help support revitalization initiatives recommended by DURF if URA considers the recommendation appropriate and subject to URA's financial and other capacities.
- (e) *URA's role in redevelopment -- "implementer" and "facilitator"* -- URA will maintain its existing "implementer" role in executing redevelopment projects except that it will take into account

DURF's recommendation. The buildings concerned should generally be aged and in dilapidated condition, the living conditions of residents are poor, and the site should generally be large enough to allow a more sizable development in providing planning gains to the wider community. Under this new redevelopment model, it can be URA initiating the redevelopment or URA responding to the request of owners, i.e., a "demand-led" redevelopment. On the other hand, URA could take up a "facilitator" role and charge a fee to help owners of buildings in multiple ownership to assemble titles for owner-initiated redevelopment. Before URA assumes a "facilitator" role for the lots concerned, the buildings have to be recommended for redevelopment at DURF.

- (f) *Compensating domestic owner-occupiers and owners of vacant or tenanted domestic units* -- The current compensation and Home Purchase Allowance ("HPA") rate which are based on a notional 7-year-old replacement flat as the standard for domestic owner-occupiers affected by URA redevelopment projects will not change. The differentiation in compensation and ex gratia payment between domestic owner-occupiers and owners of vacant or tenanted domestic units will remain. But URA is required to adopt a more compassionate approach in assessing the eligibility of owners of tenanted domestic units for full HPA rate such as needy elderly owners who rely on the rental of their rented out properties for a living.
- (g) *"Flat for flat" but no "shop for shop"* -- URA will offer "flat for flat" as an alternative option to cash compensation and ex gratia payment to the owner-occupiers. An owner opting for "flat for flat" will still be receiving compensation and ex gratia payment at the notional value of a 7-year-old replacement unit. The new flats are to be sold at market price. There will be no "shop for shop" option, as offering shop operators affected by redevelopment a shop in a future development several years later would not meet operators' primary concern for uninterrupted business. Instead, URA will provide shop operators with more assistance to re-start their business.

- (h) *Assisting tenants registered at freezing survey* -- URA should come up with enhanced policy measures to recognize the status of affected tenants registered at the point of freezing survey by URA for the purpose of rehousing or compensation and ex gratia payment in future. This is to forestall any tenant eviction or premature termination of tenancies by the owner after the freezing survey but before completion of acquisition by URA.
- (i) *Early Social Impact Assessments and independent funding for Social Service Teams* -- Some form of overall assessment of the likely social implications of a redevelopment project should be conducted as early as possible to aid the decision to undertake redevelopment. This would help DURF to ascertain if there are insurmountable negative impacts, such as destruction of local economic activities or social and cultural characteristics if the area is to be redeveloped. The social service teams presently funded by URA assisting affected tenants and households in URA redevelopment projects will be funded in future by the Urban Renewal Trust Fund so as to avoid the confusion that they are part of URA's acquisition team.
- (j) *Self-financing principle for URA* -- In line with the Administration's policy intention, the urban renewal programme of URA should be self-financing in the long run.

8. To facilitate the implementation of the revised URS, CE in Council has endorsed the following three new initiatives --

- (a) To set up the first DURF at Kowloon City;
- (b) To establish an "Urban Renewal Trust Fund" pursuant to section 6 of URAO with \$500 million injection by URA; and
- (c) The provision of one or two sites at Kai Tak Development capable of producing about 1 500 to 2 000 small and medium-sized flats ranging from 40 to 60 m² to facilitate the implementation of "flat for flat" compensation option.

Views and concerns expressed by members on the work of the Urban Renewal Authority and the review of the first Urban Renewal Strategy

9. After publication of the draft text of the revised URS, the Panel had discussion with the Administration on 26 October 2010, and held two special meetings on 20 November 2010 and 7 December 2010 to hear deputations' views. Concerns and comments raised by members on the work of URA and the revised URS at these meetings are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

Establishment of District Urban Renewal Forum

10. Members were generally supportive to the proposal of establishing DURF. Some members urged the Administration to set up more DURFs as soon as possible in old urban districts including Sham Shui Po, Tai Kok Tsui and Mong Kok. There were views that DURF should not be separated from the District Councils as it would be difficult for the District Council and DURF, both being district advisory platforms, with one based on membership by election and the other based on membership by appointment, to operate in harmony. On the composition of DURF, members suggested that it should include residents' organizations and representatives of social service teams. All urban renewal plans should be discussed in DURF with wide public participation, and its support would be required for URA-implemented projects.

Project planning and design

11. Members stressed the need for the Administration to set directions and values for urban redevelopment as a whole. This would prevent URA's redevelopment projects from being taken forward in a site-by-site planning approach, resulting in adverse impact on the town planning of the broader district and problems, such as disintegration of the redevelopment areas with the surrounding environment and lack of coordination between redevelopment projects implemented by URA and private developers. Besides, in old areas where there were insufficient community facilities, URA should make use of redevelopment sites to provide such facilities rather than residential buildings. In addition, premises in a redevelopment project should be reserved for the provision of community services and operation of social enterprises because providers of these services could hardly afford the rents at private developments. Members further urged URA to set for itself a higher standard for building designs, not only to follow the provisions of the Town

Planning Ordinance, but also to take the lead in complying with the new rules regarding gross floor area concessions.

Compulsory sale for redevelopment

12. Some members urged the Administration and relevant organizations, including URA, to take timely action to assist property owners who were approached by purchasers for sale of properties under the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance (Cap. 545). They considered that while the Property Management Advisory Centres of the Hong Kong Housing Society would provide general information and distribute leaflets to property owners, no immediate and direct assistance were available to owners. URA could organize forums for property owners in concerned districts to enhance their understanding about the Ordinance and the relevant procedures. Pointing out that some purchasers of old buildings had purposely worsen the living conditions of the uncooperative owners, members urged the Administration to take action against purchasers' malicious actions. In this regards, there was a suggestion to expand URA's scope of work to help affected owners in handling problems encountered during the process of compulsory sale. As compulsory sale of properties applied to individual buildings, which could destroy urban redevelopment planning, there were views that DURF should be allowed to discuss acquisition proposals involving compulsory sale of individual lots for redevelopment before such proposals were materialized.

"Flat for flat" and "shop for shop" compensation

13. On the "flat for flat" compensation option for owner-occupiers, some members advocated that URA should offer "foot for foot" compensation to allow affected owners to have replacement units no smaller than those they had. Taking the criteria of compensation of a 7-year-old replacement unit and considering that residential units under the Sandwich Class Housing Scheme were of about 80% of the prices of private developments, some members recommended that such units could be adopted as the standard of properties to be provided for "foot for foot" compensation.

14. While welcoming the arrangement for URA to build housing units at Kai Tak Development to facilitate the "flat for flat" option, members suggested that URA should extend the "flat-for-flat" scheme to affected property owners in all redevelopment projects. As for those owners who

opted the "flat-for-flat" arrangement, URA should pay them the difference, if any, between the market value of a flat comparable to the owner's flat within the same district and the new flat to be provided under the "flat-for-flat" scheme. For those owners who had to pay for the difference in cost involved, i.e., when the value of the new flat is higher than the value of a "comparable" flat, in order to relieve financial burden on the owners, URA should allow them to defer the payments.

15. Some members reiterated their requests for the Administration to consider "shop for shop" compensation for shop operators affected by redevelopment projects as operators could hardly afford to continue their business in the newly developed large shopping malls. URA should also assist small traditional businesses to continue their operation in redeveloped areas.

16. Some members further suggested that the Administration should consider introducing a mechanism whereby affected property owners could share the profits, at and above a certain level, generated from URA redevelopment projects. The suggestion would help mitigate affected owners' discontent towards redevelopment projects. Moreover, there were views that in-situ re-housing arrangement for affected residents should be made via the provision of housing units of the Hong Kong Housing Society and the Hong Kong Housing Authority. Furthermore, affected residents should be given the choice to determine whether their properties should be redeveloped by URA through voting or legally binding surveys.

Urban Renewal Authority as an implementer and a facilitator

17. Members were concerned about the mechanism for URA to determine either to adopt an implementer or a facilitator role in a redevelopment project. They suggested that the principles in this regard should be laid down in objective terms in the final URS. On URA's role as a facilitator, members expressed concern about the procedures for triggering URA-facilitated projects, and whether funds would be made available to affected owners for solving housing problems before the redevelopments were completed.

The mode of operation of URA, its financial independence and transparency

18. Some members opined that the future direction for URA should be independent redevelopment. Given URA's ability to self-finance its

redevelopment projects, it should not collaborate with big businesses in undertaking redevelopment projects, which had been perceived by the public as examples of "government-business collusion". URA should have a clear positioning as an organization to assist property owners affected by redevelopment projects and should not take part in building luxury apartments. The incidents of over-aggressive pricing for the small and medium-sized units in URA's projects should not repeat. However, there was concern about the requirement for URA to adopt a self-financing operation model, which could restrict its flexibility in implementing redevelopment projects. On the other hand, it was proposed that URA should increase transparency in its financial position, in particular, the profits and loss in respect of each of the redevelopment projects.

Regular review of the Urban Renewal Strategy

19. Some members noticed that the URS promulgated in 2001 had stated that the strategy would be reviewed and updated regularly. However, there was no such statement in the draft text of the revised URS. They urged that the need for URA to undertake further review of its URS should be clearly stated in the final revised URS.

Recent developments

20. At the Legislative Council meeting of 5 January 2011, Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun raised a written question on DURF. The question and the Administration's reply are at **Appendix I**.

21. On 24 February 2011, the Development Bureau ("DEVB") promulgated the new URS⁴. All future URA projects commencing after that date will be implemented in accordance with the new URS. When preparing its draft corporate plans, URA has to follow the guidelines set out in URS. The new URS contains a paragraph, which was not in the draft text, stating that URS will be reviewed and updated from time to time and the public will be consulted on any revised URS in future before it is finalized for implementation.

⁴ The new URS is available on DEVB's website at http://www.devb.gov.hk/filemanager/en/Content_3/URS_eng_2011.pdf.

22. On 27 May 2011, DEVB announced the appointment of 20 non-official and official members to the first DURF at Kowloon City for a term of three years from 1 June 2011⁵.

23. On 31 May 2011, URA announced the framework of a "demand-led" redevelopment model. Under the model, owners of 67% (i.e. 2/3) or more of the undivided shares of the respective lots of a site may jointly submit an application to URA to initiate a demand-led project. The proposed project should be situated within redevelopment zones identified by DURF or at least outside DURF's proposed preservation areas, if there is DURF in that district. Buildings in the application site should have been identified as "poor or varied". Applications for demand-led projects are open from July to October 2011. One to two demand-led development projects will be tried out as a pilot scheme⁶.

24. The Administration will brief the Panel on the progress of the work of URA and its plan for the next financial year at the meeting on 28 June 2011.

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

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
23 June 2011

⁵ The press release about the appointment is available on DEVB's website at http://www.devb.gov.hk/en/publications_and_press_releases/press/index_id_6600.html.

⁶ The press release about the framework of a "demand-led" redevelopment model is available on URA's website at <http://www.ura.org.hk/html/c1002112e396e.html>.

Appendix I

Question No. 7 at the Legislative Council meeting of 5 January 2011

District Urban Renewal Forum

Dr Priscilla LEUNG (in Chinese): President, in his 2010-2011 Policy Address, the Chief Executive proposes to set up District Urban Renewal Forums (DURFs) to collect views from professionals and local residents, with the first pilot DURF to be set up in Kowloon City. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) when the first DURF will be set up the earliest; what principles the Government will adopt in appointing members to DURF, and the respective ratios of members from the Government, business sector, local residents and professionals; and DURF's foremost work plan upon its establishment;
- (b) given that the authorities have proposed in the "Public Views and Future Direction Paper", which was released at the final stage (that is, the Consensus Building Stage) of the Urban Renewal Strategy Review, that DURF "should be independent of District Council (DC)", how DURF will communicate and co-operate with DC in future;
- (c) whether the tasks or terms of reference of DURF will overlap with those of the Town Planning Board (TPB) in future; if so, how the authorities will deal with it;
- (d) given that apart from Kowloon City, there are many old buildings in other districts in Kowloon, whether the authorities at present have any plan to set up DURFs in other districts; if so, when these DURFs will be established the earliest; and
- (e) how the authorities ensure that the views of DURF will be given due consideration?

Secretary for Development (in Chinese): President, my reply to the five-part question is as follows:

- (a) The Development Bureau plans to promulgate the revised "Urban Renewal Strategy" (URS) in the first quarter of 2011 and set up the first DURF in Kowloon City District as announced in the Chief Executive's 2010-2011 Policy Address. The objective of establishing DURFs is to implement urban renewal following local characteristics and aspirations more systematically through a platform guided by professionals, with the participation of members of the local community and facilitated by government departments. The Chairman of DURF will come from a professional discipline familiar with urban renewal issues. Membership will include District Councillors/Area Committee members, professionals, established non-government organizations/groups serving the district, and representatives of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and relevant government departments. We are now considering the membership of DURF and non-official members will be appointed by the Government in their personal capacities. While we will not have any predetermined ratio for members based on their background, we will strive to include a broad spectrum of representatives from different fields. The top priority for DURFs is to provide advice on district-based urban renewal initiatives (including locations where rehabilitation, redevelopment or preservation should be carried out) from a holistic and integrated perspective through public engagement and studies.
- (b) While the DURFs will be independent of the DCs, interaction between them can be achieved through exchanges and joint activities. Moreover, we will actively consider inviting local District Council members to serve as members of DURFs.
- (c) DURFs are consultative in nature and not statutory bodies. DURFs will adopt a "people-centred, bottom-up, district-based" approach to recommend urban renewal initiatives for the old districts. TPB is a statutory body responsible for the systematic preparation of draft plans for the lay-out of such areas of Hong Kong as the Chief Executive may direct, as well as the types of buildings suitable for erection therein, and the preparation of draft development permission area plans according to the Town Planning Ordinance. There is no overlap between DURFs and the TPB in their work or functions. In fact, if the recommendations of DURFs involve amendments to Outline Zoning Plans or require prior

approvals of the TPB, the implementation agents concerned will proceed in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance.

- (d) We will decide on where to set up the second DURF in the light of the experience gained in the operation of the first DURF established in Kowloon City, and also having regard to the number and conditions of dilapidated buildings in various districts. For the time being, we have yet to firm up a timetable for setting up other DURFs.
- (e) The setting up of DURFs to facilitate urban renewal of old districts is an important initiative under the revised URS announced after a two-year public engagement exercise. It is also a key measure to implement the "people-centred, bottom-up, district-based" approach. The revised URS has been endorsed by the Executive Council and announced by the Chief Executive in his 2010-2011 Policy Address, and hence is a policy agenda of the Special Administrative Region Government and a blueprint guiding the work of the URA. Besides, the Government has earmarked additional resources for the creation of eight non-directorate posts and will apply to the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council for funding to create a directorate post of Chief Town Planner so as to make sure that there will be sufficient manpower resource to support the work of DURFs. The \$500 million Urban Renewal Trust Fund to be set up will also ensure that DURFs will have sufficient funding to conduct researches, organize public engagement activities and carry out other work. The Development Bureau will monitor the overall operation of DURFs to ensure that their recommendations will be adopted where appropriate.

Work of the Urban Renewal Authority

List of relevant papers

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
3 October 2001	The Panel on Planning, Land and Works ("PLW Panel") discussed the consultation paper on the 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 first URS.	<p>Urban renewal strategy http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0208-217-1e-scan.pdf</p>
21 June 2002	The Finance Committee approved a new commitment of \$10 billion under the Capital Investment	<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>

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
	Fund for injection as equity into the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA").	
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>
17 May 2006	Legislative Council meeting -- a motion on "Review on URS" was debated and negatived	<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	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
7 February 2007	Legislative Council meeting -- an oral question on URS	Official Record of Proceedings (Pages 45 to 55) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0207-translate-e.pdf
27 November 2007	The Panel on Development ("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
24 June 2008	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS and the work of URA.	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 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 Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2322/07-08) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/minutes/de080624.pdf
17 July 2008	The Development Bureau formally launched a review of the first URS.	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

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
20 January 2009	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS.	<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> <p>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</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1948/08-09) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20090120.pdf</p>
15 April 2009	DEV Panel received public views on the review of the first URS.	<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> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2772/08-09) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20090415.pdf</p>
23 February 2010	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS.	<p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1712/09-10) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20100223.pdf</p>
25 May 2010	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS.	<p>Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1910/09-10(07)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0525cb1-1919-7-e.pdf</p> <p>Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)1910/09-10(08)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0525cb1-1919-8-e.pdf</p>

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
		Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2602/09-10) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20100525.pdf
10 July 2010	DEV Panel received public views on the review of the first URS.	Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2943/09-10) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20100710.pdf
26 October 2010	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the draft text of the revised URS.	Information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)155/10-11(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1026cb1-155-4-e.pdf Legislative Council Brief on "People First: A District-based and Public Participation Approach to Urban Renewal - Urban Renewal Strategy Review" (File Ref.: DEVB(PL-CR)1-150/77) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1026-devbplcr115077-e.pdf Background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)155/10-11(05)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1026cb1-155-5-e.pdf Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)736/10-11) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20101026.pdf
20 November 2010	DEV Panel received public views on the draft text of the revised URS.	Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1309/10-11) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20101120.pdf

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
7 December 2010	DEV Panel received public views on the draft text of the revised URS.	Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1605/10-11) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20101207.pdf
5 January 2011	Legislative Council meeting -- a written question on the District Urban Renewal Forum	Official Record of Proceedings (Pages 4182-4184) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0105-translate-e.pdf