

Bills Committee on Urban Renewal Authority Bill

Concerns raised at the meetings on 5 June 2000

Members requested the Administration -

- (a) to estimate the additional costs incurred should the basis for calculating the Home Purchase Allowance be revised to a replacement flat of 8 years' old;
- (b) to consider requiring tenants who have received cash compensation to reimburse the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) on a pro rata basis should they choose to be allocated a public housing flat before the expiry of the three-year period;
- (c) to advise the mean of cash compensation offered by Land Development Corporation (LDC) to tenants of domestic premises affected by its redevelopment projects over the past years;
- (d) to provide a list of the uncompleted projects of the LDC including ongoing projects and announced projects which have not yet started. As freezing surveys have been conducted on these projects, the Administration is also requested to provide information on the number of persons to be affected and the estimated costs of each of the projects;
- (e) to review the need for setting up a Provisional Urban Renewal Authority. Some members are of the view that since the LDC would continue to exercise the powers conferred under the LDC Ordinance after the passage of the Bill and before the URA Ordinance comes into operation, the setting up of a preparation committee or working group to deal with transitional matters will suffice;
- (f) to review clause 3(3). Some members are concerned about the implication of the express reference to URA not being regarded as an agent of the Government;
- (g) to clarify whether non-executive directors will be held personally liable for the decisions of the URA Board and reflect the policy intention in the Bill; and

- (h) to stipulate in the Bill that orders made by the Chief Executive under clause 5(f) are subsidiary legislation.

Legislative Council Secretariat

5 June 2000

