

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1133/17-18(04)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 26 June 2018

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

Purpose

This paper provides background information on the Urban Renewal Strategy ("URS") and the work of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"). It also summarizes the views and concerns expressed by Members at the meetings of the Legislative Council and the Panel on Development ("DEV Panel") on the subjects since the 2010-2011 legislative session.

Establishment of the Urban Renewal Authority and promulgation of the 2011 Urban Renewal Strategy

2. URA was established on 1 May 2001 to undertake urban renewal in accordance with the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (Cap. 563) ("URAO") enacted in June 2000. Under section 21 of URAO, URA is required to follow the guidelines set out in URS formulated by the Administration in undertaking redevelopment projects. Under URS, a comprehensive and holistic approach should be adopted to rejuvenate older urban areas by way of redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalization and heritage preservation. The [first URS](#) was promulgated in November 2001. Between July 2008 and June 2010, the Administration reviewed the 2001 URS and conducted a two-year, three-stage public engagement exercise. On 24 February 2011, the new URS, highlighting a "people first, district-based and public participatory" approach ("[the 2011 URS](#)") was drawn up and promulgated.

Implementation of the 2011 Urban Renewal Strategy

3. Under the 2011 URS, URA is tasked to adopt "Redevelopment" and "Rehabilitation" as its core businesses.

Redevelopment

4. In line with the 2011 URS, URA has adopted a three-pronged approach in redevelopment, namely, undertaking URA-initiated projects, undertaking owner-initiated demand-led projects and facilitating owners in the assembly of property titles for redevelopment. Up to 31 July 2017, URA had directly, or through collaboration with the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS"), commenced and implemented 66 redevelopment projects.

5. Some Members have expressed concern about the slow progress of the urban redevelopment process and urged the Administration, together with URA, to conduct a review to find out the reasons. The Administration advised that URA had encountered many challenges and difficulties in carrying out its work in its first 10 years of work. This had prompted the Administration to conduct the URS review in 2008. As regards the suggestion to review the 2011 URS, the Administration advised that the new measures recommended in the 2011 URS had only been implemented for a few years, and it would take time to consolidate experience to map out improvements.

Demand-led Redevelopment Project Pilot Scheme

6. Under the Demand-led Redevelopment Project Pilot Scheme ("Demand-led Scheme") launched in July 2011, property owners could initiate redevelopment by submitting an application to URA to redevelop their buildings/lots. Following a review of the Demand-led Scheme in 2014, revisions to the application and scoring criteria were made. The major revisions included increasing the minimum site size of applications, raising the first owners' consent threshold, and attaching a greater weighting to building conditions in the scoring criteria for applications. The details of the revisions are in **Appendix I**. The revised application and scoring criteria were then applied to the fourth and fifth rounds of the Demand-led Scheme launched in July 2015 and February 2016.

7. DEV Panel noted that under the refined application requirements for the Demand-led Scheme, if an application involved a building with outstanding building orders issued by the Buildings Department, it would receive a lower score in the assessment. Members expressed concern on

whether such revisions would slow down the pace of redevelopment of dilapidated buildings. URA advised that in assessing an application, the condition of the concerned building would account for 50% of the total scores. URA did not encourage owners to neglect their duty of building maintenance by seeking redevelopment of their buildings through the scheme, and hence buildings with long outstanding building orders would have their scores deducted.

8. DEV Panel members observed that URA had not selected any project from the applications for the Demand-led Scheme in 2015-2016 after the revision of the Scheme. They were concerned whether it had become difficult for owners of private buildings to meet the refined application and scoring criteria under the Scheme. Members questioned whether the Demand-led Scheme would exist in name only. The Administration advised that after completing the review on the Demand-led Scheme, URA had only received two rounds of applications. It was premature for the Administration to draw a conclusion on the effectiveness of the Demand-led Scheme under the refined application and scoring criteria. URA advised that it had no plan to discontinue the Demand-led Scheme.

District-based approach

9. Some DEV Panel members said that URA should review its current approach to redevelopment, and consider whether it should take forward its redevelopment projects from the perspective of regenerating a district as a whole, instead of redeveloping individual old buildings in a piecemeal manner. URA advised that a new district-based approach in urban renewal was adopted. This approach could secure greater planning and social gains than scattered "pencil block" or other smaller redevelopment projects. Since March 2016, URA had commenced five development projects/schemes in Kowloon City under the district-based approach. In addition to providing a total of about 2 820 residential flats upon completion by 2025-2026, these projects/schemes would also bring about planning and social gains and enhance the road network in the Kowloon City district.

District planning study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kong Districts

10. With a view to identifying more effective and efficient ways for urban renewal, URA commenced in May 2017 a two-year district planning study on a pilot basis for the Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok districts ("Yau Mong District Study"). The study will explore ways of enhancing the efficiency of existing land use and modes in building rehabilitation in Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok which are two typical old urban districts so as to meet the development needs

of the community through better utilization of land. URA will formulate a "Master Renewal Concept Plan" for the two districts to plan for more efficient road networks and community facilities, and will incorporate the elements of "Smart City", in the future planning of these districts and further promote the "Place Making" concept to bring about wider benefits for the local community. The Yau Mong District Study will serve as an important basis for URA to extend practicable ideas and modus operandi to other districts and the work strategy of urban renewal in future.

11. While members were generally supportive of carrying out the Yau Mong District Study, they hoped that a financially sustainable master renewal concept plan for the districts would be devised under the Study.

Facilitating services

12. URA has set up a wholly-owned subsidiary, Urban Redevelopment Facilitating Services Company Limited ("URFSL"), to implement the Facilitating Services Pilot Scheme ("Facilitating Scheme") to help owners of buildings in multiple-ownership to assemble titles for redevelopment. The "facilitator" service opened for applications on 26 July 2011. Up to 31 March 2017, URFSL had successfully facilitated the joint sale by public auction of one project site under the Facilitating Scheme. To submit a joint application to URA for the service, owners should have at least 50% or more of the undivided shares of the interests of each lot of the site. The role of URA is confined to coordinating the assembly of 80% to 90% of the titles in the subject buildings for joint sale in the market, and URA would not be involved in the acquisition of any interest in the buildings.

13. Members had expressed concern on the small scale of the Facilitating Scheme. URA explained that as the Facilitating Scheme was still a relatively new URA initiative, and site assembly usually took time, the level of interest in the services so far matched the URA's expectation. In December 2014, URA announced the enhanced "Facilitating Scheme" to expand the scope of service to cover commercial buildings and industrial buildings within non-industrial zones. Since May 2016, a new pilot scheme has been put in place to provide facilitating services to building owners under the Civil Servants' Cooperative Building Society Scheme and Government Built Housing Scheme under a separate queue.

Compensation arrangements and "Flat for Flat" Scheme

14. The current compensation and Home Purchase Allowance ("HPA") rate adopted by URA for domestic owner-occupiers affected by URA redevelopment projects are based on a notional seven-year-old replacement flat. There is a differentiation in compensation and ex-gratia payment between domestic owner-occupiers and owners of vacant or tenanted domestic units. Under the 2011 URS, URA has introduced the "Compassionate Allowance for Elderly Domestic Owner-Landlords"¹ to help elderly owner-landlords who rely on rental income from their sole and rented property affected by URA redevelopment projects to sustain their livelihood.

15. Under the 2011 URS, URA offers "flat for flat" ("FFF") to the owner-occupiers affected by its redevelopment projects. An owner-occupier opting for FFF will receive compensation and ex-gratia payment at the notional value of a seven-year-old replacement unit, and will be given a choice to use the amount of compensation and ex-gratia payment offered to them to buy a FFF unit. The new flats under the FFF Scheme are to be sold at market price. The owner-occupier can opt for either an "in-situ" FFF unit in URA's new development at the original site or for a unit at De Novo, a URA project at Kai Tak. As at 31 July 2017, 10 owners have opted to participate in the scheme, among which eight have taken up units at De Novo, and two have opted for an in-situ FFF unit.

16. Some Members pointed out that there was a large discrepancy in the acquisition price offered by URA to owners and the price of the redeveloped properties. Affected owners might not be able to afford the flats under the FFF Scheme and hence could not move back to live in the redeveloped areas. Members were also concerned about the assistance URA would offer to affected residents with imminent housing needs.

17. URA explained that for the owner-occupiers of properties affected by URA's redevelopment projects, the acquisition offer was based on the value of a seven-year-old replacement flat in the same locality. This rate, roughly around double the market price of the affected property, would allow the owner-occupier to purchase a replacement property in a nearby area. It was inappropriate to compare the acquisition price with the selling price of a redeveloped property, given that in a booming property market, the property price would rise, and vice versa. URA advised that while there were

¹ Under the scheme, eligible elderly owner-landlords can receive compensation close to 80% of HPA, which is higher than the normal Supplementary Allowance payable to owner-landlords at 50% of HPA.

practical difficulties in fully preserving the social networks, the Authority would work harder in this respect. It considered that, when the FFF units at Kai Tak were completed and some more redeveloped flats in old areas became available later under the FFF Scheme, more owners would show interest as they could move directly from an old flat to a new one.

18. URA also advised that tenants affected by its redevelopment projects who met the eligibility criteria for public housing might elect for a public housing unit provided by the Hong Kong Housing Authority or HKHS. URA owned four rehousing blocks² with a total of 502 units that were generally used as interim housing for domestic tenants affected by its redevelopment projects before they were qualified for public rental housing.

19. The Administration advised that a trust fund had been set up by URA to provide funding support to social service teams appointed to provide assistance and advice to residents affected by URA's redevelopment projects.

District Urban Renewal Forums

20. Another highlight of the 2011 URS is the establishment of District Urban Renewal Forums ("DURFs") in old urban districts to advise the Administration on urban renewal proposals from a holistic and integrated perspective taking account of local characteristics. The Government established the first pilot DURF in Kowloon City in June 2011.³ Members of DEV Panel welcomed the initiative and called on the Administration to set up DURFs in other old urban districts, such as Tai Kok Tsui, Sham Shui Po and Mong Kok, as soon as possible.

² The four rehousing blocks are Shun Sing Mansion at No. 466, Des Voeux Road West; Rich Building at Nos. 163-165, Lai Chi Kok Road, Sham Shui Po; Bedford Tower at Nos. 68-72, Bedford Road, Tai Kok Tsui; and No. 12, Soy Street, Mong Kok ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)1210/14-15\(01\)](#))

³ On 29 January 2014, the Kowloon City DURF finalized the Urban Renewal Plan for the district. The Administration advised members at the DEV Panel meeting on 24 June 2014 that it was conducting an internal study on the plan.

Rehabilitation

21. To assist building owners in need to carry out repair and maintenance works, URA has participated in the "Operation Building Bright" ("OBB"),⁴ launched by the Administration in 2009, and in collaboration with HKHS, implemented various assistance schemes such as the Integrated Building Maintenance Assistance Scheme ("IBMAS"). Following an agreement between URA and HKHS, URA has been progressively taking over the Rehabilitation Scheme Areas of HKHS under IBMAS since 2013. With effect from 1 July 2015, URA handles all new applications under IBMAS.

22. The Chief Executive announced in her Policy Address on 11 October 2017 the Government's plan to launch OBB 2.0 at a cost of \$3 billion to provide direct technical and financial assistance to needy owners in carrying out the prescribed inspection and repair works under the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme.⁵ URA would administer OBB 2.0 as the Government's partner.

23. Taking in view that URA's work in the rehabilitation of old buildings involved increasing workload and might sustain financial loss, some Members urged the Administration to examine the role of URA in this aspect of work. In response, the Administration stressed that building rehabilitation was a major work area of URA. While agreeing that the additional workload would generate pressure on its manpower resources, URA advised that it would accord priorities to the cases that were more urgent. In response to members' concern on whether URA could deploy sufficient manpower resources to take over all the Rehabilitation Scheme Areas previously managed by HKHS under IBMAS, URA assured members that it would keep in view the manpower resources required for taking over the work of HKHS in building rehabilitation and would allocate additional resources to cope with the additional workload as necessary.

⁴ OBB involves a total funding of \$3.5 billion contributed by the Administration, for URA and HKHS to provide financial and technical assistance to over 3 100 buildings aged over 30 years. OBB is a special measure for preserving jobs amidst the 2008 financial tsunami to provide subsidies and one-stop technical assistance to help owners of old and dilapidated buildings to carry out repair and maintenance works.

⁵ A funding commitment of \$3,000,000 for the new item on Operation Building Bright 2.0 was sought in the context of the Appropriation Bill 2018. The Appropriation Bill 2018 was passed at the Council meeting on 10 May 2018.

24. Some Members suggested that URA should strengthen its role in assisting property owners of aged buildings without owners' corporations and building management services in carrying out maintenance works for their buildings. The Administration agreed that it was necessary to explore high-level cross-bureau collaboration in pursuing proper management of residential buildings without owners' corporations.

"Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitating Services (Pilot Scheme)

25. At the Council meetings of 2 December 2015 and 7 June 2017, Members debated motions on combating acts of bid-rigging in repair works of private residential buildings, and urged the Administration to commission statutory bodies with credibility such as URA to provide property owners with professional building repair works services of authorized persons, such as information on works supervision and costs estimation, etc.⁶

26. In May 2016, URA launched the "Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitating Services (Pilot Scheme) ("Smart Tender Scheme") to provide technical support to owners' corporations of private buildings to carry out building repair and maintenance works and to reduce the risk of bid-rigging at the works procurement stage. The scheme includes provision of guidelines and contract samples, arranging professionals to provide independent advice, establishing an electronic tendering platform, etc. The details of the technical assistance provided under the Smart Tender Scheme are set out in **Appendix II**. Since October 2016, the eligibility criteria of the Smart Tender Scheme have been extended and relaxed to cover all private residential/composite buildings in Hong Kong, regardless of the building age and the average rateable value.

27. To help more property owners secure the necessary technical support in carrying out building maintenance works, the Administration has included a commitment of \$300 million in the 2017-2018 Estimates to allow property owners to participate in the Smart Tender Scheme at a concessionary rate. The aim is to encourage more property owners to take up the Smart Tender Scheme with a view to creating a critical mass of participants, which will not only cultivates the best practices in undertaking building repair and maintenance projects, but also help crowd out the opportunity for bid-rigging syndicates to interfere with the building repair and maintenance markets. DEV Panel members welcomed the initiative, and called on the

⁶ The hyperlinks on the wordings of the two motions passed are provided in **Appendix III**.

Administration and URA to strengthen public education and publicity on the scheme.

28. Some members called on URA to consider extending the scope of the Smart Tender Scheme to assist owners' corporations of private buildings in the procurement of consultancy services for carrying out building rehabilitation works, including arranging an independent adviser to offer professional and technical advice and to give an assessment on the market price of the tender.

29. URA advised that it would consider the feasibility of extending the scope of the electronic tendering platform of the Smart Tender Scheme to assist owners' corporations in engaging consultants. URA would also explore ways to assist owners in analyzing the tenders received from consultants. In addition, URA would set up a new Building Rehabilitation Platform as an all-in-one centre to provide relevant information and technical support to owners.

Preservation and Revitalization

30. While redevelopment and rehabilitation are URA's core businesses under the 2011 URS, URA continues to allocate resources to those preservation and revitalization projects to which it has already committed. Major projects included the two shophouse preservation projects at Prince Edward Road West/Yuen Ngai Street and Shanghai Street/Argyle Street, Central Market (Central Oasis).

31. When the revitalization of the Central Market was first announced in 2009, URA projected that it would need \$500 million to complete the revitalization works. According to URA, with the rise in construction cost over time, the original estimate had been rendered out-of-date. As such, URA considered it necessary to revisit the project details to rationalize both the cost and the works to be carried out. Subsequently, URA had decided to adopt a simplified revitalization scheme with an estimated cost of about \$740 million (at 2016 prices). The project was expected to be completed by 2021.⁷ Some members opined that the revitalized Central Market should provide affordable retail facilities and eateries, rather than expensive branded stores.

⁷ Source: [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)117/17-18\(02\)](#)

Subsidized sale flats

32. In response to the then Chief Executive's suggestion in the 2015 Policy Address to increase the supply of subsidized sale flats ("SSF"),⁸ URA has identified part of the De Novo flats at Kai Tak for the SSF purpose,⁹ and will give further thoughts to the feasibility of providing SSFs at the Ma Tau Wai Road/Chun Tin Street redevelopment project site.

33. Some members called on the Administration and URA to consider reviewing URA's role to shoulder more social responsibility by making use of the land resumed to develop public housing units, including SSFs.

34. The Administration advised that, the redevelopment projects undertaken by URA since its establishment mainly focused on the redevelopment of private properties. The modus operandi of URA had all along been generating revenue through the sale of units constructed after redevelopment, so as to achieve the long-term objective of a self-financing urban renewal programme. If the redevelopment projects of URA were used to develop public housing, the Government and URA had to carefully consider the impact of this fundamental change on the supply of public and private housing and the self-financing mode of operation of URA. On this premise, the Administration would make reference to the outcome of the Yau Mong District Study and explore with URA whether or not there was room to pursue different types of housing in suitable redevelopment projects.

Financial position of the Urban Renewal Authority

35. As at 31 March 2017, URA's net asset value stood at \$32.6 billion, including a capital injection totalling \$10 billion from the Government. URA has estimated that a total expenditure of about \$34.96 billion, excluding operational overheads, would be required to meet the costs of all projects contained in its 2017-2018 to 2021-2022 Corporate Plan.

⁸ In his 2015 Policy Address, the then Chief Executive stated that high property prices resulted in a marked increase in demand from low- and middle-income families for Home Ownership Scheme flats or other subsidized flats, and the Administration must therefore actively explore ways to increase the supply of sale flats through a multi-pronged approach by engaging public or non-profit-making organizations such as URA.

⁹ URA launched the Kai Tak SSF Scheme on 4 January 2016.

36. DEV Panel members considered that urban renewal work was important to the community as it would improve the living conditions of residents in dilapidated buildings and address the problem of urban decay. While URA should operate in a financially sustainable manner, it should not adopt a profit-oriented approach to urban renewal. The Administration should assist URA in overcoming the difficulties that it might face in taking forward the initiatives under the 2011 URS and in meeting the needs and aspirations of those affected by redevelopment projects.

37. The Administration advised that profit maximization had never been an objective of URA, and the Authority would continue to take forward its work under the long-term self-financing objective. While redevelopment as one of the businesses of URA might generate surplus, its other activities such as rehabilitation, preserving buildings with heritage value and revitalizing the areas within URA's project sites were not-for-profit and might incur financial loss. To support URA in taking forward the urban renewal programme, apart from the \$10 billion capital injection and land premium concessions, URA had been offered "linked sites" on a few occasions which effectively allowed URA to link up the implementation of two redevelopment projects, one of which was profitable and the other not. While assuring URA on the Administration's commitment to providing financial support to the cause of urban renewal, the Administration had asked URA to critically review its financial strength.

38. In December 2014, the URA Board commissioned a management consultant to undertake a value-for-money ("VFM") study to review the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the Authority's operation, and to conduct an organization structure review ("OSR") of URA. The VFM study and OSR were completed in September 2015. URA advised DEV Panel in June 2016 that it had been taking forward the recommendations, including, inter alia, the district-based approach to urban renewal, providing more facilitating services, strengthening project management and developing key performance indicators.

Recent developments

39. At the meeting of DEV Panel to be held on 26 June 2018, the Administration and URA will brief the Panel on the progress of work of URA in 2017-2018 and its plan for the next financial year, as well as the progress of the implementation of URS.

40. A list of relevant papers with their hyperlinks is in **Appendix III**.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 June 2018

Major revisions to the Demand-led Scheme

The Urban Renewal Authority completed a review of the Demand-led Scheme and announced revisions to the scheme in early December 2014. The major revisions are as follows:¹⁰

- (a) raising the application threshold of requiring not less than 67% owners' consent to not less than 80% owners' consent so that the 'demand-led' projects to be selected in future will have secured a higher degree of support from the incumbent owners at the point of application in order to enhance the chance for the project to proceed smoothly;
- (b) increasing the minimum site size of applications from 400 m² to 700 m² so as to enhance the planning gain and efficiency of floor layout of the 'demand-led' project upon redevelopment; and
- (c) assigning greater weighting to the conditions of buildings covered by the applications in the project selection process. If the application involves buildings with long outstanding building orders issued by the Buildings Department, scores will be deducted. This is to make it clear that the Urban Renewal Authority does not encourage dereliction of owners' duty of building maintenance and management by seeking redevelopment of their buildings through the Demand-led Scheme.

¹⁰ Source: The Administration's paper on work of the Urban Renewal Authority (discussed at the DEV Panel meeting on 23 June 2015) ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)987/14-15\(03\)](#))

"Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitating Services (Pilot Scheme)

The technical assistance provided under the "Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitating Services (Pilot Scheme) of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") includes the following aspects:¹¹

- (a) URA will provide participating building owners with a set of "DIY tool-kits" to guide them in organising building repair and maintenance works. The tool-kits will include guidelines and pro-forma documents to facilitate the proper procurement of contractors for undertaking the works and consultants for overseeing the works, as well as other tips and instructions;
- (b) URA will line up an independent third-party advisor to offer advice to the participating building owners. The advice to be given by the advisor will cover the general scope of works needed to be carried out and an estimate on the cost of such works. On the basis of the advice, the participating building owners may then assess whether the tender prices received for the works are reasonable; and
- (c) URA will make available an electronic tendering platform for building owners to conduct the tendering exercise for engaging contractors. By inviting and receiving expression-of-interest and issuing tender documents through the tendering platform and keeping the identity of tenderers anonymous until tender opening, the risk of the tendering process being manipulated or interfered by axe-grinders can be reduced.

¹¹ Source: The Administration's paper on initiatives of Development Bureau in the 2016 Policy Address and Policy Agenda ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)452/15-16\(03\)](#))

Work of the Urban Renewal Authority

List of relevant papers

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
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)]
20 January 2009	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(08)] Background brief [LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(09)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1948/08-09]
15 April 2009	DEV Panel received public views on the review of the first URS.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1240/08-09(01)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)2772/08-09]
23 February 2010	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1157/09-10(03)] Background brief [LC Paper No. CB(1)1157/09-10(04)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1712/09-10]
25 May 2010	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the review of the first URS.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1919/09-10(07)] Background brief [LC Paper No. CB(1)1919/09-10(08)]

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
		Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)2602/09-10]
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]
26 October 2010	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the draft text of the revised URS.	<p>The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)155/10-11(04)]</p> <p>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]</p> <p>Background brief [LC Paper No. CB(1)155/10-11(05)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)736/10-11]</p>
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]
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]
28 June 2011	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	<p>The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)2530/10-11(03)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)693/11-12]</p>

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
28 June 2012	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)2207/11-12(01)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)2599/11-12]
25 June 2013	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1333/12-13(03)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)203/13-14]
25 March 2014	The Administration provided an information paper in response to a letter from a member on the Demand-led Redevelopment Project Pilot Scheme of URA.	Information paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1127/13-14(01)]
7 May 2014	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 8) on "Demand-led Redevelopment Project Pilot Scheme" (p. 10352-10354)
14 May 2014	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 9) on "Demand-led Redevelopment Project Pilot Scheme" (p. 10943-10950)
24 June 2014	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1623/13-14(03)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)214/14-15]
28 January 2015	An oral question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — oral question (No. 6) on "The Work of Urban Renewal Authority" (p. 5189-5198)

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
12 May 2015	The Administration provided an information paper in response to a letter from Hon James TO and Hon Emily LAU about the resignation of Managing Director of URA.	Information paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)846/14-15(01)]
23 June 2015	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)987/14-15(03)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1286/14-15] Follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1210/14-15(01)]
2 December 2015	A motion was debated at the Council Meeting.	Motion on combating acts of bid-rigging in repair works of private residential buildings Progress report
26 January 2016	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the initiatives of Development Bureau in the 2016 Policy Address and Policy Agenda.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)452/15-16(03)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)812/15-16]
2 March 2016	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 10) on "Support for property owners in carrying out building maintenance works" (p. 6141-6148)
20 April 2016	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 15) on "Rehousing and Compensation for Tenants Affected by Redevelopment Projects" (p. 7634-7639)

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
18 May 2016	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 8) on "Urban renewal project in Eight "Wan" Streets and the vicinity" (p. 9621-9624)
28 March 2017	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the Budget initiative to encourage property owners to participate in URA's "Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitation Services scheme.	The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)699/16-17(06)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)951/16-17] Follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)866/16-17(01)]
31 May 2017	An oral question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — oral question (No. 4) on "Conservation and revitalization of the Central Market Building" (p. 8737-8746)
7 June 2017	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 12) on "Compensation for owners affected by redevelopment projects of the Urban Renewal Authority" (p. 9174-9181)
7 June 2017	A motion was debated at the Council Meeting.	Motion on combating bid-rigging to defend the rights and interests of property owners Progress report
21 June 2017	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 17) on "Land resumption by the Government for the redevelopment projects implemented by Urban Renewal Authority" (p. 10251-10254)

Date	Event	Papers/Minutes of meeting
31 October 2017	DEV Panel discussed with the Administration the work of URA.	<p>The Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)117/17-18(02)]</p> <p>Updated background brief on the Urban Renewal Strategy and the work of the Urban Renewal Authority prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat [LC Paper No. CB(1)117/17-18(03)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)484/17-18]</p> <p>Follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)306/17-18(01)]</p> <p>The Administration's response to motions passed [LC Paper No. CB(1)305/17-18(01)]</p>
25 October 2017	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 13) on "Statistics and allocation of the rehousing flats of the Urban Renewal Authority" (p. 598-603)
10 January 2018	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 21) on "Urban renewal" (p. 4742-4748)
28 February 2018	A written question was raised at the Council meeting.	Hansard — written question (No. 16) on "Arrangements for compulsory resumption of property titles for redevelopment projects" (p. 7179-7185)