

Subcommittee to study the Urban Renewal Authority White Bill

Concerns raised at the meeting on 20 January 2000

Members requested the Administration -

- (a) to review the need to expressly provide in the Bill the principles for compensation for resuming properties affected by Urban Renewal Authority's (URA) redevelopment projects, i.e. statutory compensation plus an ex gratia allowance. As pointed out by some members, given that affected owners would have no choice but to surrender their flats to make way for redevelopment, it is neither fair nor adequate to provide them with statutory compensation only under the Lands Resumption Ordinance. An ex gratia allowance should be part and parcel of the compensation package. Affected owners should be entitled to this allowance in any event and entitlement should not be subject to the Administration's discretion depending on individual circumstances;
- (b) to provide detailed information on the delineation of responsibilities between URA and the Building Authority (BA) concerning remedial actions taken in respect of dangerous buildings and building maintenance in both target and non-target areas. Some members are concerned about the maintenance of buildings in non-target areas which have been identified for redevelopment and how URA and BA would co-ordinate in this respect;
- (c) to reconsider the Executive-Chairman model for the URA Board. Some members are concerned that there would be inadequate checks and balances in such a structural establishment; and
- (d) to reconsider the proposed composition of the URA Board. Given that the decisions of the URA Board would have wide-ranging economic and social implications and for the purpose of enhancing public confidence on the Board, some members consider it necessary to increase the number of non-executive directors who are not public officers.